

# THE STUDENT WORLD

A quarterly magazine published at 13 Rue Calvin, Geneva  
by the World's Student Christian Federation

ROBERT C. MACKIE, *Editor*

---

VOLUME XL

Fourth Quarter, 1947

NUMBER 4

---

## EDITORIAL

### Christian Study of the University

*The national student Christian movements are becoming increasingly concerned with the problem of the university itself. The reason for this concern is a severely practical one. No longer is it possible to isolate students from their environment and to consider them as young men and women conveniently grouped for purposes of Christian evangelism and education. The environment refuses to be neglected. The character of the university has such a profound effect upon its members, and basically such a non-religious effect, that the Christian faith appears irrelevant. The prophets are in danger of crying in a very real wilderness, and the presentation of the Christian Gospel runs the risk, not only of looking ridiculous, which is its glory, but of being ridiculous, which is its disgrace.*

*It was in relation to this acute situation that the Federation launched a study of the problem of the university with the "Greybook" by John Coleman, entitled The Task of the Christian in the University, and eventually summoned a selected conference of professors, student leaders and students to meet at the Château de Bossey, near Geneva, in July 1947. The Statement by the group of university teachers present, published in this issue, indicates the nature of the approach to the problem which was taken at the Conference. The article entitled A Christian Discussion*

of the University summarises some leading points in the discussion. The articles by Professor Willey, Professor Bratsiotis, Professor Capek and M. M. Thomas of the Federation staff, are really notes of talks given at the Conference, in one or two cases even without previous preparation. Those by Ronald Preston and T. R. Milford are records of addresses given at the Lundsberg Summer Conference of the Federation, and a British S.C.M. Study Conference respectively. What this issue of *The Student World* may lose, therefore, in academic quality, it certainly gains in pointed relevance to an ongoing discussion. It is the hope of the authors that it will provoke an even wider and deeper reflection within the national movements and the Federation than has already taken place.

It is not necessary here to attempt yet another diagnosis of the sickness in the body of the university. Ronald Preston has done this most ably in his article. The university teachers have concentrated on three key points in their statement. The present-day weakness of the university, they say, is due to a divorce between its teaching and Christian faith, a failure to create a community in which personal relationships are possible, and a betrayal of its responsibility to society. If this judgment is true, then the Christian claims of a life made whole in Jesus Christ, of the fellowship of men and women in Him, and of a sense of mission in His name, are daily contradicted by the whole trend of the life and teaching of the university. While this situation is no reason for discouragement on the part of the individual Christian, who must not ask for an easy sphere in which to witness, it makes it well-nigh impossible for him to avoid the intellectual and moral pit-fall of a divided mind. So far as the Christian Church is concerned the university is marked off as virtually a "prohibited area". The only exceptions are services of worship, which too often are purely formal ceremonies, and incidental communities of like-minded Christians, seeking to retain a foothold for faith in a pagan environment. Theological faculties, where these exist, seldom affect profoundly the life around them.

*This situation presents a challenge to the World's Student Christian Federation, and the discovery of the Bossey Conference was that the challenge had two distinct, though closely related, aspects. In the first place, this is a university problem, and it is therefore important that Christian university teachers should not treat it as an interesting side-line, but should put their minds to its solution. They, of all people, must not allow the university to drift, but must help it to fulfil its purpose. Initium sapientiae timor Domini still holds true, but exhortation will get us nowhere. The connection between the fear of the Lord and human wisdom has largely been lost and it must be rediscovered through a fresh dedication of mind and spirit.*

*There is now very considerable evidence that the national movements and the Federation are in a strategic position for helping to organise this senior Christian study of the university. It is precisely such an informal approach, with its combination of senior and junior elements in the university, and its ability to secure the help of selected graduates, that seems most likely to stimulate fruitful consideration of the questions involved. It is greatly to be hoped, therefore, that discussions, on a local, national or international scale, where these questions are thrashed out, will be multiplied. The result will surely be still greater clarity in diagnosis, coupled with definite suggestions of how rethinking on a Christian basis can take place in the several university disciplines. There is a specialist job here which specialists must carry out, but it may have far-reaching effects upon the lives of future generations of students.*

*The second form of the challenge is precisely to a rethinking and replanning of the daily work of the Christian movements, associations, groups, or what you will, in the university. In the making of programmes, students are appallingly conservative! Fifty years ago our movements were launched and rapidly developed patterns, which have remained substantially unaltered. The weekly address by a speaker, the study circle, the meeting for prayer, the conference, were designed to meet a particular situation. How much notice has been taken of the extent to which it*

*has changed ? Kindly senior friends from the churches come and speak to us about the faith ; little groups fall gently asleep over the study of biblical passages which seem to bear little relation to their life as students ; meetings for prayer are occasions when the very faithful discover somewhat anxiously how small a band they are ; conferences are inspiring but produce an experience which is the very antithesis to that of the university ; missions to the university are usually found to have been helpful largely to those who ran them ! Surely the time has come for us to take stock in a hard-headed way of the forces which are really moulding our own lives and those of our contemporaries, and then to plan an offensive which, if it does not shake the gothic or classical temples in which an outmoded worship of reason is carried on, will at least stimulate the most sensitive of our fellow-students to a radical view of life, a biblical view of life, a thorough-going allegiance to Christ Himself, which must have revolutionary results.*

*It may be, as M. M. Thomas suggests, that we are entering the dark ages of the university, and that the Federation and other Christian organisations may be entrusted with more responsibility for preserving intellectual light, which is the light of Christ, than they at present realise. But the main moral for each one of us is that we should not be too afraid or too lazy to study the university in which the Gospel has to be lived and preached, and that we should put any bit of understanding that may come to us from this study into use. Meetings which relate the Christian faith to our university studies, detailed faculty or professional discussions of the implications of that faith, Bible or doctrinal study-circles which involve the type of concentrated preparation usually reserved for pre-examination spurts, and common prayer which deals with concrete situations in the university and leads to group and individual action — that is the kind of framework which will enable the work of our movements to be more relevant to the needs of our fellow-students, and therefore more fully dedicated to the glory of God.*

R.C.M.

# **The Crisis in the University**

## **A Statement by an International Group of University Teachers**

From the years immediately preceding the war discussions have gone on in several countries concerning the nature and function of the university. Several national S.C.M.s have carried on these discussions from the specifically Christian point of view. But it is not only in Christian, or even in academic, circles that such subjects have been discussed. Governments have become increasingly interested in the last few years in the work of the universities, and in many countries the end of the war has seen a vast expansion in the number of students. This increased recognition of the importance of the university has been very largely the result of the war, which demonstrated in a vivid way the value of scientific research in the service of the nation. This situation not only raises problems about the structure and administration of the university, but confronts us with the question of the whole purpose and basis of university education.

Although work has been carried on by several national S.C.M.s, it was felt that the time had arrived when an international conference within a Christian framework should be held to view the subject over a wider field. With this in mind, the W.S.C.F. held such a conference at the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey, July 4-10 1947. At the conclusion of the conference, the following statement was drawn up by the university teachers present :

*The scope of the conference*

It was with profound gratitude that we took part in this international conference of university teachers and national S.C.M. leaders and members, called by the W.S.C.F. to consider the task of the Christian in the university.

In this conference, representatives of ten different countries have engaged in full and free discussion of papers on *The Church's Task and the University, Faith and Reason, Professor and Student, Society, and History*. We would now briefly share the results of our discussion with all those who may be interested in the problem of the university. This was a conference of university teachers of literature, law, mathematics, theology and philosophy. Unfortunately, the natural sciences and some of the humanities were not represented, though those aspects of university study were not neglected in the discussions.

*The crisis in the university*

As the conference developed, though we differed in a number of points and approached the question from different angles, we discovered a substantial measure of agreement in the nature of the crisis in the university and in society. The conference diligently considered the relation between students and teachers, between the members of different faculties, between the different courses of study, between the various views of history and between the university and society. On each one of these topics, the conference arrived at a fair amount of agreement. We would sum up the results by saying :

- a) We consider that the implications of the Christian faith in the various spheres of knowledge have not been taken seriously with the result that our teaching and scholarship are divorced from our religious life and beliefs.

- b) The university is no longer seen as a community with a purpose which both teachers and students jointly seek to realise. Personality can only develop within a community. Such community as does exist in the university is, in varying degrees, on a superficial level which prevents real personal relationships of a Christian profundity amongst students themselves; and between teachers and students.
- c) In the university, we can see the concentrations of power, the interests and tensions of the society in which the university exists. The university, instead of presenting to society a community based upon the common purpose of a search for truth in the service of God, and giving it leadership, too often reflects the weaknesses and corruptions of society.

### *The university and the Federation*

In the university are focussed many of our greatest contemporary problems and we welcome the lead which the W.S.C.F. and some of the national S.C.M.s have given in bringing the problem of the university to the fore. We urge that the W.S.C.F. should concentrate its energies on this subject in the years that lie ahead. Members of the W.S.C.F. should pay attention to their vocation as students. Careful study and prayer should be given to the subject of the nature of the University and the Christian's task within it.

### *The Christian's task in the university*

We appeal, therefore, to all Christian members of the university, whether teachers or students, to consider and pray about their vocation in the light of their Christian belief. We appeal to all Christian men and women who have had the advantage of a university education to bring a Christian discernment to bear upon their professional work. Never was there a time when it was more necessary that technical and profes-

sional competence should be reinforced by moral leadership and insight derived from the Christian faith.

There are also those who, while not professing the Christian faith, share its cultural heritage and uphold its values. We hope that they also will cooperate with Christians in many of the immediate steps which will serve to revivify the Movement.

JAQUES BLONDEL (France).

PANAYOTIS BRATSIOTIS (Greece).

RAYMOND BRETT (England).

J.-B. CAPEK (Czechoslovakia.)

PAUL GEORG LINDHARDT (Denmark).

AKE MALMSTRÖM (Sweden).

C. S. PAUL (India).

PAUL RAMSEY (United States of America).

JOACHIM WACH (United States of America).

BASIL WILLEY (England).

---

## A Christian Discussion of the University

A. J. COLEMAN

It is not easy to describe in a few words the subject-matter of the University Conference of the W.S.C.F., held at the Château de Bossey, near Geneva, from July 4th—10th, 1947. The meeting brought into the sharpest focus we have yet achieved the discussion which has been widespread in the Federation for over ten years, sometimes under the title *The Problem of the University*, and at others, *The Task of the Christian in the University*. Part of our discussion was a Christian critique of the university and an attempt to state our ideal for the university. This involved facing the alleged evils of over-specialization, the disintegration of university community, and the failure of the university to

be in lively and relevant interaction with society at large. But in addition to this discussion, which often went along lines familiar in non-Christian circles, we asked, "What is the specific witness and responsibility of Christians in the university? Is there Christian mathematics? Christian sociology? Christian theology? Does the Federation have a responsibility to help professors understand and perform their tasks as Christians?" And there were many more questions which we raised.

The reader will not imagine that we achieved final and definitive answers to all these thorny problems. No. The value of the conference lay rather in the fact that it was an experience of real meeting, which brought those present to a unanimous conviction that the issues which we faced together at Bossey must become the framework for rethinking the whole task of the Federation on the years immediately ahead. What follows is in no sense an objective report of our discussion, but simply the effort of one participant to record his imperfect understanding of some of the points of view expressed.

### *The state of the student*

Let us crash in on Bossey on Sunday afternoon when a discussion of the relation of the Christian professor to his students is in progress.

CZECH: The greatest danger among our students today is not fanaticism but indifference. The experience of the past years has made students apathetic.

CANADIAN: Apathy stems from hopelessness.

DUTCHMAN I: Among Dutch students there is almost no hope for the future. Everyone expects war, though they don't know why. They are too tired to make analyses or therefore decisions. This leads to the need for authority. But who can be this authority, since the older generation is not trusted by the students? It means that the young professors have a very special responsibility.

FRENCHMAN : Most of our students go to the university merely to get a good job, and professors encourage this utilitarian attitude to education. This means that students have little time and energy for the great issues of life. Occasionally, it is true, the French professor gets to know his students through some social function, but his relation to them remains superficial, and at most he is only an intellectual guide. It is only surreptitiously that he dares smuggle into his lectures references to the deeper truths about life. Spiritual life is no concern of our secularized university and this attitude is really encouraged by the Roman Catholic line that faith is exclusively the concern of the Church.

CHAIRMAN : But is it not true that there is a great deal of cultural interest among French students ?

FRENCHMAN : Yes, in the sense that the French student, especially in Paris, is not apathetic. He goes to hundreds of public lectures. He listens and listens and listens. But he seldom makes up his mind.

CZECH : Let's analyse the apathy. Partly it is due to the fact that the crowded post-war universities contain a large number of people who are not students at all in any real sense. In many cases, it is simply a matter of nervous fatigue which will improve with food and rest. But often it is due to disillusionment during the war. Our job is to help such students believe again, to help them see that all life is not dirty and cruel. And on the whole, I have found the interest in spiritual problems greater than before the war.

CHAIRMAN : To sum up, do we not agree that apathy in students is due to three main causes : 1) War-fatigue heightened by lack of adequate food in recent years ; 2) Disillusionment in students who resisted *against* something but now cannot say what they resisted *for* ; 3) The unconscious fear of uncovering problems to which there are no answers ?

If this is the situation, what should be the relation of a Christian professor to his students ?

DANE : In Danish universities the professor is free to plan his work as he likes, so feeling a lack of personal contact with my students I have handed over all lectures to my able assistants and conduct the seminars myself. There, contact is perfect, and it is quite impossible for me to hide my own views on any question. If we were to choose among the possibilities of relation to students suggested in our agenda, I would say that I should dislike being an "intimate friend", I should deplore being a "guardian", but would be glad to be "a guide and counsellor". What, then, is the task of the Christian professor ? As a "Christian professor" I have no task at all. As a Christian, I have the task of being the best possible professor and colleague.

ENGLISHMAN I : In the ancient English universities the dons who live in college have continuous opportunity for contact with students. In this context the task of the Christian professor is not to insinuate his Christianity into his lectures in the classroom but to communicate it by what he is known to be in extramural life. And believe me, there is nothing which the college undergraduate does not know about his tutors !

But I would still be interested to hear how far you think the Christian professor should go in his lectures in making his faith explicit. I feel that the most one should attempt is to show the reasonableness of a believing attitude.

AMERICAN I : This would agree with the point which someone made yesterday in our discussion of Faith and Reason, that the function of reason in defence of faith is chiefly, perhaps wholly, the negative one of clearing away impediments and objections to faith. But how can one make a transition from religiousness in general to the Christian faith ? There is, it seems to

me, an irreducible dogmatic element in Christianity and it is best conveyed to students by focussing on the concept of the "personal".

CANADIAN : Certainly it is not our duty to defend some pale, vapid, general "religiosity".

INDIAN I : I agree. It is not faith as such, but the Christian faith which we must advocate. Indeed, I do not believe there is such a thing as "faith as such".

WELSHMAN : Is not our real problem that there is a dominant university ideology propagated in both East and West which is implicitly accepted by all students except those few who cling to traditional forms ? We should try to analyse this.

INDIAN II : You are probably right and I think that the core of this ideology is science. Yet it is possible to live in two different worlds. I know a Hindu professor of astronomy who inculcates Western science into his pupils and on one occasion demonstrated an eclipse of the moon to them through a telescope, giving them at the same time a full scientific explanation of the event. After it was over, he went home and took a purifying bath to cleanse himself of the possible evil effects of the serpent which, as a Hindu, he believed had caused the eclipse.

GREEK : However, we must not forget that science is no longer enthroned and that scientists are themselves questioning it in real ways.

CZECH : To return to our English friend's question, it is clear that in some subjects one has a better chance than in others to deal with matters on which Christian faith has a bearing. Thus a teacher of literature in Czechoslovakia cannot evade discussing the values which motivated our great writers and the bearing they have on the history of the country. Thus, through the medium of our students themselves, there is a constant and vigorous debate in progress between different professors on such questions as

the relative importance of economic or moral factors in the history of Czechoslovakia.

AMERICAN II: I feel that students could legitimately expect their professors to make their own bias explicit. Further, that the university should not be content to assume a dilletante, irresponsible attitude, but should discuss what are called in the U.S.A. "life-options". While the professor should not attempt explicit proselytising, he should try to ensure that his students are brought face to face with the challenge of a genuine Christian position, and should then be prepared to answer honestly and sincerely the questions which this challenge evokes.

### *University and society*

This topic was opened up by M. M. Thomas, who argued that one of the most important duties of the university in society was to promulgate what he called the "rational values". The gist of his speech is contained in his article elsewhere in this issue. Some of the reactions to his remarks can perhaps be best recorded in our stylised dialogue.

AMERICAN I: This subject ties up with yesterday's discussion because the apathy of the present day student is, in my opinion, chiefly due to the cessation of the creative influence of Christianity on our culture. At its inception Christianity supplied Western culture with its dynamic sense of the significance of history and of truth. This creative relation must be restored and it can only be done through the university.

AMERICAN II: I was especially happy about Mr. Thomas' emphasis on a concept of order. Though "order" in scholasticism was accompanied by stagnation, it does not necessarily imply stagnation. Indeed, all great periods of cultural activity have had such a concept. The order need not be frozen and static,

but should be able to advance without upsetting the balance when changes of emphasis occur.

I also welcomed his emphasis on the "theology of the machine" which would attempt some constructive and systematic Christian evaluation of the place of the machine and techniques in our society. Usually, hitherto, technology has been the object of uncritical adulation or unthinking condemnation. A justification of the machine, which at the same time showed its limits, is especially necessary in a country like the U.S.A., where it is an urgent challenge to Christian thinkers.

**DUTCHMAN II:** The technical and professional side of the university seems especially important to me because it is the graduates of law, engineering, medicine, etc., who, through the positions they hold in society, are able to integrate the values for which the university stands into culture.

**WELSHMAN:** Indeed, in the modern English universities, the medical and engineering student can most often be depended upon to attend discussions and lectures on serious subjects. Their curriculum provides them with a framework for achieving some measure of shape in their education. The arts curriculum is completely amorphous. The practical students are the most aware of the total human significance of their studies.

**SECRETARY:** It is an interesting fact that practically no engineers end up in mental hospitals. If we understood why, I suspect that we would know a great deal about society and education.

**CHAIRMAN:** All my experience in the S.C.M. suggests that the most common complaint is that medical and engineering students do not have time to think!

**WELSHMAN:** There is some truth in that, but even so I maintain that the medical curriculum in England calls forth the personal abilities of students in relation to culture better than the Arts curriculum.

AMERICAN III: This would be true in the States too if you mean developing the mind along certain, narrow lines. But that is *not* education. One of the most reactionary groups in the U.S.A. is the American Medical Association.

SWEDE: There may be a closer relation between the technical student and his special field in society, but the growing specialisation leads also to increasing isolation and fragmentation. We are building up a "trades union mentality" in our students. Furthermore, the separation of the faculty of law from the university resulted in a dichotomy between theory and social practice.

SECRETARY: The theological seminaries are an especially vivid example of this evil, for too often their separation from the university has resulted in their degeneration into professional schools in the narrowest and most reprehensible sense. In the long run a sharp dichotomy between the university and professional schools is detrimental to both. It means that the university becomes more and more cut off from the real needs of society, finally becoming irrelevant and losing all power over society. It means that the professional schools, cut off from the revivifying and broadening force of planning and revolutionary reason, finally become narrow and tradition-bound.

FRENCHMAN: There is another aspect of professional training which we must face as Christians. Society wants technicians. Will we not soon be faced with the situation in our planned economies when the state will demand that a university produce exactly sixty doctors, shall we say. How can Christians accept limitations of such a nature on vocational choice when we remember that vocation is a gift from God?

INDIAN I: I do not see that there need be any conflict since as Christians we must be prepared to agree that because of its responsibility to society the uni-

versity must be willing to accommodate itself to the necessities of social planning.

ENGLISHMAN II: I do not at all agree with the implied theology of vocation in our French friend's statement. The sense of vocation does not necessarily attach to doing what you want to do. "Vocation" implies doing one's present job as a Christian, whether you like the job or not.

AMERICAN III: This notion of "vocation" is of crucial importance. To help students in their present mood of hopelessness and sense of crisis we must enable them to see a purpose in living, which the university must interpret to students and to society. Vocation must be seen as giving a meaningful interpretation to their work and as implying participation in the process of mankind. This last must be related to an interpretation of the cosmic purpose of life.

AMERICAN I: All this discussion is interesting enough, but it presupposes a more or less stable society with fixed meanings for the "professions". Over lunch I was thinking about the contribution which the Irish monks made to society. Their chief function was to pass on the values which they had received from tradition, "the faith delivered to them by the saints". So I think that an indispensable part of the idea of the university is tradition. It was not by making some brilliant guess about the future of the procession of mankind that the Irish monks put us forever in their debt, but simply by transmitting faithfully values which they had inherited.

AMERICAN II: One cannot deny that there is a great deal of truth in my compatriot's remarks as long as it is remembered that a spirit of adventure is part of the tradition of which we are the custodians.

SECRETARY: The point of "American I" that only in a stable society has "profession" any fixed significant meaning is most illuminating and far-reaching. In such a society it is meaningful to discuss changes in

the form of curricula of universities and in the type of graduate which society can absorb and so on, and the Christian must contribute to such discussions. But in an unstable society they are almost completely devoid of relevance.

In an unstable society the real problem is rather to have foresight as to what are the most creative elements in the situation and try to produce people capable of remaining cool-headed and make some positive contribution as civilisation enters in travail. The necessary foresight and courage can come only from heightened sensitivity and intense community life. Therefore, I consider it the duty of Christian professors to build up "cells" or small groups of Christian students who will be the adventurous custodians of the real spirit of the university. At present most of our countries manifest elements of stability and instability, and the particular point at which we are called to act depends on the special vocation of each of us.

### *A Protestant alternative to Thomism ?*

I have not yet been involved in a discussion of the university problem more than ten minutes before someone has asked, "Does being a Christian make any difference to the way you teach mathematics?" We often piously assert that Jesus Christ is Lord over every realm of life and in particular over every realm of thought. If we really mean such a statement, the "every" should include mathematics, history, psychology and law. At one point the chairman raised the question rather vividly.

CHAIRMAN : What difference does it make to a professor in his actual teaching and in his life as a professor whether or not he is a Christian ? In his opening speech on Friday night, when Dr. Visser'tHooft asserted that Christ's Lordship implied dominion over every intellectual discipline, was he making a meaningful statement, or was he simply talking

through his hat, as enthusiastic theologians sometimes do ?

SWEDEN : I can plainly see that this raises a real question for law, the teaching of which has two aspects. There is the study of the *historical facts* about the construction of different legal codes which absorbs a great deal, possibly most, of the professor's energy and this must be carried on in as objective a way as possible, and to this I do not see that Christianity is particularly relevant. But it is clear that the *social application* of law is based on value judgments most of which are implicit in the mores of the society and some of which derive from Christianity. We cannot compare these various values from a purely rational starting-point, but we can and should enable the student to see that laws are in fact based on and directed by evaluations.

The Christian professor should not preach in his lectures, but should "open the doors" for his students. Again it is clear to me that his faith will affect the choice of subjects about which the Christian lectures. I am really in a dilemma, since the recent discussions of natural law, such as that contained in Brunner's interesting book, do not convince me any more than does Thomism. Since I see no alternative way of making the Lordship of Christ meaningful in law, I resort to the working hypothesis that the science of law is possible independently of an integral Christian basis.

DANE : There is no such thing as a Christian science whether it is a Christian science of law or a Christian science of theology. In both cases to fulfil his human vocation the professor's essential task as scientist is to achieve true description, to be a good professor. If he leads his students to being truly scientific he has succeeded as a professor.

INDIAN II : In India the most important contribution of the Christian professor is not through the subject-

matter of his course but through his personality. The typical Indian professor has a servant who proceeds him to the lecture room carrying his books, and announces his arrival so that the students become quiet before he enters. He delivers the lecture and immediately leaves, without giving his students any opportunity to speak to him. This mode of conduct is, of course, largely motivated by fear lest intimate contact with students would break through his many artificial defences and reveal his basic moral bankruptcy. In such a situation the Christian can make a real witness to the demand of Christ that we should seek the truth, simply by being open and approachable so that the student may recognize an honest attitude to life.

CANADIAN STUDENT: My ideal professor would do four things:

1. At the beginning of a course he would specify the limits of his subject, its relation to other subjects and its value. This last point he would open for discussion and questioning.
2. From time to time during the course he would step out of his rôle as objective professor and evaluate the process in which they were together engaged.
3. He would be prepared to follow up the implications of his lectures for relevant public issues which arise during the term. This is also something for which Ortega y Gasset pleads in his, *The Mission of the University*.
4. Outside the lectures, through the total life of the campus, he would help his students gain some integral view of the purpose of the university.

NEW ZEALAND STUDENT: The relation of the faith of a professor to his subject is a question of burning interest to me as a theological student for most of my professors seem to live their lives as preachers and as students of theology on two unrelated planes.

We listen to brilliant lectures on the New Testament which are worse than useless in helping us come to a real, personal faith. We have many social contacts with professors, but hardly ever do these lead to discussions of the real, soul-searching perplexities of the students.

Professor Bratsiotis' insistence in his speech on the difference between a Christian and a non-Christian interpretation of history seems to me to be a creative step forward, for it impels the professor to recognise that he must bring his faith into relation with his teaching.

CZECH : In my country there is a strong anti-historical movement. It is the duty of Christians to insist on the significance of history. As for current non-Christian interpretations of history, marxism is the most influential and we should vigorously combat its narrow-minded emphasis on economic factors alone. However, the chief danger of marxism comes not from its arguments, but from the enthusiasm which it evokes, the sort of enthusiasm which in the time of Hus was called forth by the Christian movement.

INDIAN I : While I agree that marxism can be justly criticized, we must remember that any Christian view of history must result in personal decision, and this requires an analysis of the relation of personal effort to the economic and other material functions of man. For this, materialism is much more helpful to us than any form of philosophical idealism. I, for one, believe that marxism is very helpful in enabling us to formulate observable laws of social change.

SWEDE : A Christian professor must study history on a rational level and so will never reach an ultimate meaning which overrides other, rational interpretations of history.

AMERICAN II : The study of history, as of every other subject, is based on certain presuppositions, but for the elucidation of these we are greatly handicapped

by the fact that philosophers seem to have forgotten the functions which they used to perform of relating different fields of knowledge and providing the orientation of each field in the whole university. One of the difficulties for Protestant scholars is that we lack any proper concept of tradition which would enable us gradually to build up a Christian rationale for our subjects.

DANE : I have the uneasy feeling of being surrounded by Thomists, who believe that Christianity can "save" civilisation, or that faith and reason can discover some ultimate meaning or teleology in life. It is exactly the scandal of the Cross that we cannot find such an all-embracing meaning. By being crucified with Christ we do discover that He shares our lack of meaning.

There is no such thing as *the* Christian interpretation of history. We cannot hope to go to the Bible, which was relevant to a totally different historical situation, and out of a few odd quotations from St. Paul or Isaiah obtain *the* Christian interpretation of history. The authors of the New Testament do agree that in Christ alone is our salvation. But this is far from being a philosophy of history.

ENGLISHMAN III : But whether or not you call it a philosophy of history, surely the fact that God became incarnate affects your attitude to history.

DANE : Perhaps it affects my personal attitude. But as an historian it is my duty to give my students facts, and for the discovery of those facts I have at my disposal exactly the same methods, and no others, as my non-Christian colleagues. It is essential to distinguish clearly between one's function as professor and as preacher.

NEW ZEALAND STUDENT : I find your position profoundly unsatisfactory.

SECRETARY : I do too, for it seems to separate completely faith and reason which, being functions of one per-

sonality, must to my mind be inextricably intertwined.

WELSHMAN : But it has the great advantage of enabling him to avoid the dangers of what in England we call the "Christian racket", that is, the temptation to misuse the prestige of Christian prejudice to hide what is in the last analysis lack of belief in the transforming energy of the Living God. Thus in England, public university occasions often are opened with prayer, or some other polite bow in the direction of Christianity, which adds a Christian veneer to what is really a basically un-Christian set-up.

FRENCHMAN : But his position completely fails to show how the Lordship of Christ is in the slightest degree relevant to history.

SWEDE : We do not seem to have made much progress, and I confess that this discussion is another instance of my oft-repeated experience with theologians that when we laymen go to them asking for bread they give us stones. When we ask them for concrete illumination on some moral or ethical problem which arises in our minds in connection with our scientific work all they provide is some vague generalisations that are almost worthless. Perhaps this is inevitable unless we have constructed some new form of scholasticism. But we also find it difficult to understand their highly technical vocabulary, and even more difficult to follow the extreme swings of theological fashion. Each theologian seems to run off helter-skelter in his own direction, and has not patience to build bridges of understanding with his fellow theologians, which would provide us who teach law and history, etc., with some relatively stable basis on which to establish our subject.

WELSHMAN : I think that your strictures on us theologians have considerable justification, and I am fully persuaded that theology stands to benefit from our renewed concern for the university just as much as

other subjects. It is not a case of theology deigning to clear up the difficulties in their foundations. Rather, theologians need a totally new conception of their rôle in the university. Part of their task is to realise that they are men alongside other men in the university, and should be exposed to attack and criticism from all sides. All the difficulties in the university should be mirrored in the soul of the theologian so that the self-consciousness of the university and the agony of a truly committed search for demanding truth should reach maximum intensity in him. It is his special task to set all the problems of the university in the light of the Word of God.

If this is to be real, we need a new strategy of work. Rather than sitting in our studies trying to formulate new scholasticisms, we theologians should stand beside the doctor, the lawyer and the scientist in constant, sympathetic converse with him, trying to view his problems from inside his situation, adding a voice with our own specialist knowledge to the voices which are prompting him, so that he can more surely come to a responsible decision. The theologian's task is not to achieve some nice, quiet, scientific description. It is to engage in a battle for the world. And unless we come to grips with the real world we betray our *raison d'être*.

Barth has said that, "theology is faith trying to understand itself on its own presuppositions". And those presuppositions are the living contact of a living God with the real situation of man. The theologian is committed not only to the task of casting down every high thing which exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, but also of bringing into the open all the doubts and fears which trouble his own mind and casting them down. For without this he does not possess that faith which is the commitment of the whole man to the God who claims to be the Lord of our whole life.

## Faith and Reason

BASIL WILLEY

You have all heard of the schoolboy's definition of Faith as "believing what you know to be untrue". How little did that budding sceptic realise that he had raised, in those few words, all the profoundest issues with which theologians and metaphysicians have struggled throughout the centuries! Belief, knowledge, truth — if we only knew exactly what these are, we should have the clue to all mysteries. How do we *know* anything to be true, if we ever do? What is truth? as a celebrated biblical character once rhetorically asked. If there is such a thing, can we know it? If we can know it, do we know it in one way only, or in more than one way? Are there various degrees of certainty, such as faith, belief, assent, knowledge? Clearly we are up against a tremendous problem, and we must limit ourselves to a few simple points only, if we are not to lose our bearings.

### *Two kinds of certainty*

I suppose that when you asked me to discuss with you the question of faith and reason, you had in mind the antithesis between what we are asked to believe as Christians, and what reason or science tell us to believe about the nature of the universe, and its laws. "Faith" in this sense would mean acceptance of certain creeds and dogmas, and "reason" would mean acceptance of truths reached by experiment, observation, measure-

ment, induction, deduction and the processes of scientific method and logic. It would be more accurate, I think, to use the word "knowledge" as the antithesis to "faith", since reason is merely a method of discourse or inquiry, not a state of certainty. What we are concerned with is two *kinds* of certainty, one, that of *faith*, whereby a Christian is sure of his dogmas, and that of *knowledge*, whereby a scientist is sure of his laws of gravitation, motion, thermodynamics, conservation of energy, etc. The Christian may say that his faith is itself knowledge, but this begs our present question, and we may leave it aside for the moment.

Our problem is no new one, and I think it is always rather a relief, if also rather a humiliation, to discover that our difficulties have been encountered long ago by men wiser than ourselves. The mediaeval schoolmen taught that reason was concerned with truth, discoverable by the light of nature, and faith with truths above the reach of our natural faculties, and given to us by divine revelation. This kind of distinction was accepted in Christendom down to the 18th century at least, but it began to acquire a different meaning after the 17th century. We must now face the central question: what *kind* of truths belong to faith, and what to reason? The schoolmen believed that reason could prove the existence of God, and all the truths and duties deducible from that. Also, the main commandments or morality (to love our neighbour as ourselves, and to do as we would be done by) could be demonstrated by the light of nature. The supernatural revelation which must be believed by faith was made because, since the Fall, man's natural faculties were no longer sufficient guide to truth and beatitude. He must therefore believe that God has provided extraordinary means of salvation, and faith in the divine scheme of redemption became the first Christian duty. One may say then that faith meant belief in the following: that God has revealed His will and purpose to fallen man through the chosen race, through the prophets, supremely through His Incarnation

in Christ, and subsequently through the Scripture, and through the Church, which enjoyed the guidance and illumination of the Holy Spirit.

*The conflict between science and religion*

After the Renaissance, the sphere of reason began to be widened. Whereas it had formerly been mainly concerned with moral, logical and social, political and metaphysical questions, it now turned more and more towards the investigation of nature, and science in the modern sense of the word became its special province. After Bacon, it was increasingly accepted that experiment and induction could do for man what alchemists and magicians had vainly dreamt of — give him control over the secret forces of nature. For a time, all went well between religion and the new science ; the scientists were mostly pious men and believed that in exploring nature, they were reading the thoughts of God. There were two scriptures, the *word* of God, and the *work* of God, and to study nature (the book of his work) could not but be a powerful support to faith in his word. (This is an immense subject, and I am compelled to foreshorten it violently.) The successes of natural science were so spectacular, its generalisations so dazzlingly convincing, that scientific demonstration gradually became the type of all demonstration. A habit of mind grew up in Europe whereby it became more and more natural and inevitable, that all truth should be tested by this criterion (scientific verification). This meant a conflict with faith, not because religion appealed to truths *above* reason, but because it demanded belief in propositions *contrary* to reason.

It was in the 18th century that this conflict became acute, for it was then that men began to compare the contents of faith with those of reason, much to the detriment of the former. Reason asks you to believe in the glorious frame of the universe, majestically moving by unalterable laws ; faith asks you to believe in miracles,

i.e., infractions of that very order which so eloquently proclaims in divine original. Religion began to appear merely the crumbling repository of exploded superstitions. But it only so appeared to the enlightened few: the Voltaires and the Humes. The prestige of the Church, and in the Protestant countries the authority of the Bible, were still immensely powerful. It was thus not until the 19th century that the "religion and science" (or the faith and reason) conflict reached its crisis and climax. Our schoolboy friend mentioned above belonged to that period. The truths of science are undeniable: they are found to work; we are gaining unprecedented power by means of them. What, on the other hand, does faith offer us? a set of primitive fables, myths and legends, which it seeks to pass off upon us as divinely-attested truths and facts.

You see, I hope, how this historical sketch opens out the subject? What I am trying to emphasise is that the modern faith-reason conflict is not between reason and faith as such, but between reason and faith in a particular set of alleged facts, i.e., those contained in the Bible and the creeds. This came about because in a Protestant country like England science was confronted by a stubborn and ingrained biblical fundamentalism. When I say "science" here, I mean the spirit of scientific criticism; the conflict was the outcome much more of German biblical criticism than of Darwin's words. The unforgivable thing was not so much to hint at a divergence between Genesis and geology or evolution (this had already been overcome by allegorical interpretation), but to subject the whole Bible to the same searching analysis, and to the same literary and textual standards as had always been applied to other ancient documents. No wonder the Protestant world felt adrift; it seemed to have lost its sheet-anchor. Once the Bible had been thus deflated, it could hardly make matters worse to say that man was descended from the ape; the biblical critics were themselves convincing evidence for that theory.

*Faith changes its foundations*

I think you will agree with me that faith has survived this damaging attack ; we should not have met here unless we believed that. How has it survived ? As so often before, by abandoning its pseudo-foundations and discovering deeper and firmer ones. In the last century, I should say, the pseudo-foundations were the evidences of Christianity in the old sense. There was the proof from prophecy, the proof from miracle, the proof from design in nature. The 19th century critics did good service, though at much painful cost to simple faith, by showing the insufficiency of all three. Much prophecy was shown to have been written after the events referred to, or else to refer to other events altogether, and in any case to be truly regarded as insight rather than foresight. As for miracles, it began to dawn upon men that, whether or no they can or did happen, it is quite certain that at certain historical periods belief in them always arises, and that we can often see *how* it arises. In other words, once belief in miracles was seen as a necessary stage in the growth of religious thought, it became possible to move past them, and to find a basis for faith in something less questionable. (It was, of course, at one time a disturbing new idea that religious thought *had* a history at all, or could develop or evolve.)

So much then for the pseudo-foundations in so far as these rested in their turn on the belief in an infallible Scripture. What of the third foundation stone, the so-called proof from design in nature ? Ever since the scientific revolution of the 17th century, believers had been leaning more and more upon this. Creeds might be shaken, prophecies and miracles might be exposed, but the spacious firmament on high could not deceive ; this at least proclaimed its divine original. This belief was reinforced and perpetuated by all the incantation and fervour of romantic poetry — particularly Words-

worth's poetry, which supplied the place of religion for a good many honest doubters of the Victorian age. That unfortunate age was forced to abandon even this refuge from the storm. It was not so much that the signs of purpose in nature had vanished, though even these now appeared more like the effect of lucky variations than of conscious design. It was rather that the design, when more closely looked into than had been possible before, did not always commend itself as particularly edifying or moral, however wonderful it might be. Nature may appear divine if you consider the stars in the courses, or the lilies of the field, but rather less so if you take in the whole picture, including earthquakes, malaria-swamps, rattle-snakes, disease-germs and the struggle for existence in your survey. Nature, however enchanting her smiles may be, has too many darker moods to be worshipped as a goddess; she is, moreover apparently quite non-moral. As J. S. Mill said, "nearly all the things which men are hanged or imprisoned for doing to one another, are nature's every day performances". No wonder Tennyson said: "I found Him not in world or sun; In eagle's wing or insect's eye". He had learnt the truth which Pascal had proclaimed two hundred years before, that nature only proves God to those who believe in him already *on other grounds*. What "other grounds", then, are left? Well, there are other grounds for faith, and we must give the 19th century the credit for having found them out, deep down below the ruins of tradition.

*Faith must make its own objects real*

Let us now consider a few other definitions of faith; so far we have relied exclusively upon our schoolboy friend. Not far from him are Bacon and Sir Thomas Browne; Bacon who said that the more absurd and incredible any article of faith may be the greater honour we do to God in believing it; and Browne who said that "it is no vulgar part of Faith to believe a thing

not only above but contrary to Reason, and against the arguments of our proper Senses". But let us apply to higher authority. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews defines Faith as *the substance of things hoped for*, or in Moffatt's translation, "faith means we are confident of what we hope for, convinced of what we do not see". We seem to need a combination of the two renderings; the graphic force of the old plus the accuracy of the modern. *Faith has to make its own objects real*, and it must *realise* them and *make* them substantial. Coleridge, who pointed the way to the recovery of Faith before the 19th century débâcles, defined Faith as "the personal realisation of the reason by its union with the will". "Reason" for S.T.C. meant almost the reverse of what we have meant by it so far. It meant the organ of the supersensuous, the faculty of insight whereby spiritual truth is spiritually discerned. Faith meant trusting such insight, and making it real by acting upon it. In other words, faith is an act of our whole selves, not just an intellectual assent to propositions; it is an act, too, involving an element of venture, almost of wager. The truths of religion, as Coleridge saw, and after him Ward and Newman in particular, are truths which have to be believed at first on insufficient evidence; on evidence, that is, which would be insufficient for any rational proof, but which becomes sufficient when acted out in living. The truths of mathematics *cannot* be denied, those of religion differ in that they *can* be denied, but that *good* men will be the least inclined to do so. Suppose that they, too, were undeniable? Hear S.T.C. again: "I became convinced that religion... must have a moral origin; so far, at least, that the evidence of its doctrines could not, like the truths of abstract science, be wholly independent of the will... These truths could not be intellectually more evident without being morally less effective, without counteracting its own end by sacrificing the life of faith to the cold mechanism of a worthless, because compulsory, assent."

It was a great step forward to recognise that faith is incapable of rational demonstration, that we cannot be *argued* into it, that intellectual enquiry or wisdom (as St. Paul calls it) cannot find out God. The old evidences from nature, indeed, almost demonstrate atheism. Faith, in the sense of confidence in the reality of the unseen, springs (if it springs at all) from our whole experience as moral and spiritual beings, and not from the intellect in isolation. It springs in particular from our sense of value, our conscience, whatever it is in us which acknowledges a higher and a lower, a finer and a meaner, a beautiful and a deformed. As Newman said (Sermon X. in University Sermons): "on the level of Reason, proofs constrain assent; on that of Faith, goodness and love and purity produce it". That is why matters of faith cannot be settled in an offhand manner, as if they could be cleared up by discussion. Indeed, the value of discussion on such topics is probably only negative; it can show how faith is *not* produced, and it can clarify the boundary-line separating the spheres of faith or reason. This autonomy of faith, its independence of reason was stumbled upon, as it were accidentally, by Hume, the 18th century sceptic. "Our most holy religion", he said, "is founded upon faith, not reason, as it is a sure method of exposing it, to put it to such trials as it is by no means fitted to endure". Hume spoke ironically; for Hume to say that a belief was founded on faith, not on reason, was a mode of contemptuous dismissal. A few decades later, Europe was beginning to realise that this was the surest way of defending religion, to say that religion was founded on faith came to mean, founded upon something unassailable by the "mere" reason. Faith springs from a habit of mind, a quality of soul; mere evidences addressed to reason can be weighed by irreligious or worthless men; faith is a test of character. It was neither to the orthodox nor to the clever that Christ promised the sight of God, but to the pure in heart. If any man do His will, he shall know of the doctrine.

*The validity of spiritual experience*

It may be objected that we have given away too much ; that faith, so regarded, becomes subjective fancy, or wish-fulfilment. I think not, or not in a disparaging sense. The sense we have of absolute obligation, of commitment to that which is highest and holiest seems different in kind from any mere sentiment or fancy. The truths of reason are partial truths ; it is an abstract, skeleton world that science gives us, one susceptible of measurement, prediction and control. It has no *value* for the spirit, yet we rightly trust it and order our lives by it. Why not trust also the other findings of our consciousness : those which speak of value, of beauty, sacredness or obligation ? We need not be afraid to attribute reality to those values without which our spiritual life becomes precarious. Reason has nothing to urge here which faith cannot at once surmount ; nay more ; it is as *unreasonable* to let reason encroach upon faith as to allow faith to encroach upon reason. Faith encroached upon reason when it demanded beliefs about the universe which are disproved by observation and experiment ; reason encroaches upon faith when it denies the validity of spiritual experience and spiritual life.

I have now reached the point in the argument where argument can go no further ; it must yield to dogma. Let us suppose that we have started, as I have suggested, from our sense of the holy and the transcendent, and made the venture of faith upon the reality of these values. We shall find, if we may trust experience, and not our own only, but that of all saints and holy men, that we cannot avoid placing these values at the very core of all reality, because we find that only a life orientated towards them is truly worth living. As Plato would have said, "That good is the real, is the very ground of all being". We may not be able to reconcile this faith with the phenomena of the sensible world, but

the latter have no power to disturb one who is rooted and grounded in God.

One word more in conclusion. I have not presumed, as you will have noticed, to do more than vindicate the autonomy of religious experience in general, nor have I ventured to speculate upon the contents of a specifically *Christian* faith. I have done this for a number of reasons ; one is that I am doubtful of my own orthodoxy, another is that I really believe that a man may be a Christian in a variety of senses. But the thing I feel most sure of is that faith must be grounded upon something which, though not rationally demonstrable, is yet experimentally true, true to our experience and needs as moral beings. Starting from this, we may find that many of the specific Christian doctrines acquire a compelling power ; without the basic experience, it will be unsafe to persuade ourselves that our faith is firmly grounded. Let me end by saying, however, that for the Christian it is through and in Christ that the values themselves become known. We do not find the values, and then tack Christianity on to them ; it is through our discipleship that we come to know them. This is because the category of *personality* is the highest we know, and it is in the personality of Christ that God has manifested Himself most fully to us. Through Him we know a God who is no cold absolute, but a Being Who can be loved. Where love is, faith will not be wanting.

## Personality in Professor and Student

J. B. CAPEK

The subject assigned to the speaker was originally, "Personality versus Intellectuality in University Life". This implies the need for the professor to understand the real situation and attitudes of his students in order to be able to serve them as a person. In the past, as well as at the present time, the university professor was often looked upon only as the intellectual type. This intellectual type of scholar sees the whole of reality abstractly and thinks that his task is merely to recognise and classify. Pure intellectuality, as defined by Professor Radl, the late president of the Y.M.C.A. in Czechoslovakia, is exclusive observing without any effort to correct situations and help mankind. It is the original meaning of the word *theoria*. This intellectual type of professor is able to give all kinds of facts and figures, and to bring together a body of historical happenings, but is unable to see the challenge that these present. For that reason there have always been, and still are, scholars in our universities whose influence is purely theoretical, and quite meaningless for the development of the personality of the student.

### *The importance of personality*

What does the term "personality" mean? It is more than merely the individual. Every person is an individual, but this does not mean that he is a personality. Personality is a balanced living unity of the intellect and

the feeling, of the will and the conscience, of the theoretical basis and the practical application. It means a unique crystallized being, but nevertheless a being who is well aware of his responsibilities to society and to eternal laws. A professor, who desires to be a personality, does not only present scientific data to the students — of course he does do that very carefully and perfectly — but also is interested in the social and inner life of the students. His first duty is to know and to give knowledge ; but also to know all components of the inner life of the students, and to try to help them. This is no demagoguery, but a responsible friendship. It means to speak also in the way which is not popular, to know and to change. This is especially important at the present time, when so many of our young people need moral and spiritual guidance. The war years have left their mark on the young people, especially in the countries which were occupied by the Nazis. The foundations of our moral and spiritual life have been badly shaken during the last few years.

This has brought on greater responsibilities to the teaching profession. The work of real personalities is today much more important than ever before. The purpose of the present day university professor is not only to lecture upon scientific subjects, but also to be able to use his personality in explaining his own viewpoint on the subject matter. Seeking young people today ask not only enumeration and description, but also real interpretation and orientation. This is also the best method of dealing with the spirit of indifference which threatens so remarkable a proportion of the young generation after the war.

In addition, it is well to form smaller circles of people who are spiritually developed. Such guidance of students leads necessarily to the solution of religious questions and explanations of basic Christian principles. A unique example for all time of the most perfect personality is Jesus Christ Himself. His real disciples therefore are our most reliable leaders. It is a great task to lead

students not only to intellectuality, but first to personality, to show them the glory of reason, but also the limits of reason, and to lead them to personality as the great gift of God.

*The rôle of personality today*

Our University in Prague, which will celebrate its 600th anniversary next year, is fortunate in having had such Christian personalities as were M. Jan Hus, his disciple in the XVth century Jan Rokycana, and in the modern age, especially T. G. Masaryk. Their names are a challenge to the leading Czechoslovak professors and students of today. The rôle of personality is today far more responsible also because often the personalistic idea is forgotten when outstanding social problems are solved. The balance of the individual and the collective tendencies is the crucial task of today, and students are extremely interested in it. But the contemporary solutions are often very onesided and narrow-minded. Real development and real Christian life reside in the harmony of personalistic and social aspects. In this harmony is manifested the inner life of an individual and his service to his fellow-men. It is our duty to bring this unity about.

I believe that where there is such full life on the basis of faith; there is the full right to speak about the freedom of university, and to defend it against all external intrusions. Let us hope that many students of today are approaching such a conception of freedom.

# The Christian Student and his Studies

RONALD PRESTON

*The significance of recent thought about the university in the Federation.*

The starting point of our discussion is the conviction that it is not an accident that we are both Christians and students, but that this double aspect of our situation defines our task within God's total purpose for the world.

So far, however, the Federation has given more thought to the "Christian" than to the "student" aspect of its task. This is because the Federation has been compelled from its earliest days to think out the implications of its position vis-à-vis the Churches. The very fact that it began as an *inter*-denominational movement made it necessary for it to define its position with respect to the different Churches which were inclined to be suspicious of what was then a new phenomenon. Thus it was not possible for the Federation to exist without clarifying itself in relation to the word "Christian", and out of that process of clarification the whole ecumenical movement has under God, been established and has prospered.

But with regard to the other word, "student" the Federation was under no such immediate necessity. It was able to take the university for granted. The significance of recent discussions about the university within the Federation is that it is no longer possible to do so. In the deepening intellectual and moral chaos of the twentieth century the university itself is involved.

What we had begun to be conscious of before the war became much clearer during the war, and we now see that we have to think out our position vis-à-vis the university from its foundations. In doing so our main help so far is to be found in Arnold Nash's book *The University and the Modern World* (Macmillan, New York, \$ 2.50, 1943), in John Coleman's Grey Book *The Task of the Christian in the University* (W.S.C.F., S. Fr. 2.—, 1946) and in the twelve *University Pamphlets* published by the British S.C.M. (S.C.M. Press, London, 1s. each, 1946).

*What is the purpose of God for a university and for a Christian student ?*

If it is not an accident that we are both Christians and students, this question is clearly the most fundamental one that we have to ask.

1. Without detailing the New Testament teaching here, I would say in brief that God requires on the one hand the establishment and maintenance of a just and creative social order, or civil society, and on the other hand the building up of His Church through the mutual working together of Christians to whom the Holy Spirit distributes different gifts. The significant point is that for both tasks the service of the trained mind of the student and ex-student is essential.

2. It is worth while to dwell for a moment on the place of the student in fulfilling these two requirements. First as regards civil society. In the complex structure of modern society with its inter-locked communications and its industrial specialisation, it is impossible for society to exist without the filling of all kinds of technical and professional jobs. For these jobs a university qualification is essential. Doctors, dentists, engineers, personnel managers, social workers, civil servants, teachers and similar people are the key social group for the carrying on of society, and it is to these jobs that students go. Moreover one of the characteristics of a trained mind is

to be able to take a synoptic view, to see beyond the immediate situation to the "secondary consequences" of actions and policies, and thus, to be an essential element in the forming of opinion in a democratic society. By the very fact of the job they occupy such minds do mould opinion; from them a great deal of the democratic leadership which is needed must come. When we say for example, "Britain thinks..." we mean the 10 % of Britain who think, for nine out of ten follow a lead and do not give it. Of this tenth of the population who think a large proportion must be ex-students.

When we turn secondly to the building up of the Church we find everywhere a desperate need of lay leaders who have the ability to understand the Christian faith and its bearing upon daily life, and to express it in a language which is understood by the general public. Everywhere we need Christians who can meet the intellectual and moral questionings of our age, and where are we to find them except among those who have been students?

3. Hence it seems that God wants a "wholeness" in the university student. He wants the service of a trained mind which can see His truth steadily and as a whole, and can think out its implications for its own generation. Our Lord in His summary of the law said "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, *with all thy mind* and with all thy strength..." The phrase "with all thy mind" is not to be found in the Old Testament; perhaps it was our Lord Himself Who added it. That at any rate is a special word addressed to the student, and with it should be added St. Paul's injunction in Rom. 12: 1-2: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable liturgy. And be not fashioned according to this world: but *be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind*, that ye may prove what is the good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God."

The implication of this is that "a simple faith" is

not possible for a student. It is for others and their faith often puts us to shame. But for the student it is not possible to enter into the Kingdom of God without the service of the mind ; it is part of the obligation he undertakes when he comes to the university in the first place. The core of the Christian faith is certainly simple, terrifyingly simple, but the task of expressing it and living it in the particular complexities of our time is not simple and requires the best intellectual effort we can make to grapple with it.

*How far does the university fulfil God's requirements ?*

1. As far as providing the necessary technical and professional training which modern society needs the university does it pretty well (we may note in passing that the Arts Faculties, just as much as the Science are providing technical qualifications) but so far from producing a "wholeness" of understanding we find disintegration everywhere in the university. The disintegration shows itself in a specialisation which has destroyed intellectual contacts between subject and subject, in a lack of community between staff and staff, staff and students, and students and students. In this article we must be content with listing these points without developing them.

2. The professed ideal of the university is in many respects admirable : accuracy, the need to follow the evidence wherever it leads, freedom of research and discovery, the endeavour to avoid arbitrary presuppositions, the willingness to allow any question to be investigated and to treat no question as a closed one which cannot be asked, the sense of responsibility not to people or to society but only to truth — all these are in many ways admirable aims. In fact however under the influence of the amazing progress in natural science in the last four hundred years the university has become obsessed with methods of work proper to the natural sciences and has carried them into realms where they

are not legitimate, and has thus become very selective in its attitude to truth. Its methods of work are practical, analytical, empirical, admirable for dealing with things, but very limited in dealing with persons. This point has been summed up in the saying that the university loses the beauty of the diamond in the formula for coal.

3. Consequently the results of university education are quite different from the theory. Instead of educating allround persons, we have narrow specialists with limited horizons who have practically given up the attempt to understand one another. Instead of disinterested study we find the cultivation of examination habits (e.g. endless time spent in "spotting questions") because the university is regarded merely as the road to a career. Instead of lively and intelligent students we find most of them apathetic and taking no interest in university life beyond attending lectures and labs. The growing democratisation of the university made necessary by the expanding needs of society for university trained men has led to what has been described as a "bargain counter" view of education on the part of students and still more on the part of their parents. They regard the university degree purely as a cash investment leading to a good job.

Finally this concentration on certain scientific methods leads to the side-tracking of all important questions. Hence the word "academic" has come to have a bad sense. It has come to imply the refusal to come to any decision on crucial questions of ultimate belief or of immediate policy by taking refuge in a vague broad-mindedness, and in avoiding the point of decision by asking unanswerable questions and thus providing a rationalisation of irresponsibility.

These unsatisfactory results have produced the violent Nazi and Marxist criticisms of the whole modern liberal university and now there is the new Nihilist-Existentialist rejection of the liberal university which has been produced alike by defeat in Germany and

victory in France. Christians have also begun to criticise the whole structure.

4. We cannot dwell on the Nazi-Marxist and Existentialist criticisms, but confine ourselves to the Christian one. The heart of this is to be found in the contention that the university is not neutral on ultimate religious questions as it pretends, but is implicitly dominated by a view of life which is incompatible with the Christian faith. Arnold Nash has called this view "liberal rationalism" and it is best described in the first of the British series of *University Pamphlets* by Prof. John Baillie of Edinburgh *The Mind of the Modern University*. For our present purpose we can define liberal rationalism as a belief in progress based upon the extension of education which in turn is based on the growth and wider application of scientific knowledge; by this means the essentially good qualities of human nature will have a chance to flourish and not be thwarted by external circumstances.

This belief could be illustrated from the teaching of every subject. We shall just take two instances. a) What ground is there to suppose that there is anything in education itself which will produce virtue? Is it not just as likely to lead people to discover more intelligent ways of being selfish? b) When I had finished studying economic history at the university, I could see no connection between the kind of historical method and argument I had been using in dealing with such questions as, for example, the rise of puritanism and capitalism and their supposed connection, and the view of history which I learned in the S.C.M. according to which Christianity is a historical religion centered in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and in these events the due to history is to be found. Although my professor was a Christian he did not seem to see that there was any particular point arising here which required investigation. It is also interesting to note how the word "evolution" is so often transferred from the realm of biology to that of history without any real examination of its implications.

5. The disastrous consequences from the Christian point of view of the dominance of liberal rationalism in the university are clear. There is an obvious conflict between the view of life which regards the key to reality as something to be discovered in some unspecified future by the further development of scientific knowledge, and the Christian view that the key to reality is found in the historical events connected with Jesus Christ over nineteen hundred years in the past. There is an obvious contradiction between the essentially optimistic view of human nature which man's intellectual achievement in science has encouraged, and the Christian view that human nature is a mixture of good and bad, which cannot be altered by more knowledge, but only by a change at the centre of moral, spiritual and intellectual life.

The result of this contrast is that Christianity is politely waved aside in the modern university. It is not so much opposed as ignored. It is felt to be an irrelevant survival dealing in a pre-scientific way with problems which man has either outgrown, or else must deal with in a scientific way. Recently the head of an important British university wrote that his university professed to be religiously neutral, but in fact its whole tendency was to give the impression that the questions to which Christian doctrine addresses itself are outgrown. He added that he very much wished to find some means of at least presenting to students the seriousness of the problems with which Christian doctrine deals, and to urge that they are worthy of serious attention and personal decision, but that he could not see how in the structure of the modern university to do it.

Consequently all our efforts at evangelism are seriously hampered by this implicit attitude to Christianity. More than that Christian teachers and students tend to live in two worlds at once without realising it. With a small part of themselves in their S.C.M. life they think in Christian categories, but with the greater part of their waking life they think in quite other categories and they are unconscious of the difference.

*What can Christians do about it ?*

1. We do not want to control the university with the object of imposing the Christian view on everybody. For one thing while there is no agreed view of life in society at large it is impossible for the university to behave as if there were. For another Christian theology has a bad history of intolerance in the past and the Christian Church has too often been afraid of new truth and still is. Theology has hardly begun to come to terms with the new knowledge of the last hundred years. Christians have not got all the answers, and for the sake of Christianity itself it is important that free intellectual discussion and investigation should proceed. Further, the intellectual and moral virtues such as accuracy, imagination and critical understanding for which the university ought to stand are important to Church as well as to society. We may indeed question how long they will survive amidst the intolerance of the twentieth century without a strong Christian group to fight for them, and it may very well be that the Christians who have often been enemies of free discussion in the past may be its most solid defenders to-morrow. Hence we may say that our task is "to re-create the liberal university at a much deeper level of self-consciousness". That is to say we want a university which is really free, not spuriously free. The best example of the latter that I have met personally is the university of Brussels which describes itself as an *université libre*. In it I discovered that Roman Catholic work was not allowed, and Protestant work was only allowed unofficially. So it is clear that by "free" it means free not to believe. In contrast Christians want a university where the real issues of belief and practice in the modern world are explicitly brought to light in the common intellectual and community life of students and teachers, and the need for choice made clear. We have no space to dwell upon the ways in which this may be done in the

general academic and community life of the university, but we will content ourselves with referring briefly to some things that Christians themselves can do.

2. Christians should have a responsible attitude to their academic work and seriously endeavour to glorify God in their studies. If they are not interested in their work and cannot see how to do this they should leave the university for some other occupation. In order to glorify God by our studies we need give a reasonable amount of time to our academic work and yet avoid mere "cramming". This means, for example, trying to put a little of our own thoughts into essays and not being content with merely copying out paragraphs from different books, so that our only original contribution is the conjunctions. It also means not being so absorbed in work that the student might as well take a correspondence course for all the university community means to him.

3. The Christian student must become a "lay theologian". This sounds very formidable, but it is largely a case of doing what our S.C.M. has always tried to do, but of doing it better and seeing it within larger horizons. A lay theologian will try to understand the Bible and Christian doctrine, the implications of his own subject in relation to others, the main problems of the contemporary world in which he has to live as a citizen, and his future job in the terms of that world and of the worldwide Christian community into which he is incorporated through Christ. He will not be able to spend nearly as much time on doing this as on his academic work, but he can at least give the same quality of attention to it. He will do this by his individual reading (it is a good plan always to be reading one book which has nothing to do with our academic syllabus) by week-end Study Conferences and Reading Parties in the vacation, by study groups and by prayer. The last two are central to the life of the S.C.M. As far as prayer is concerned we need to translate our whole intellectual task as students into prayer to a much greater extent than we

usually do, and one of the Federation's most urgent tasks is to give us much help in doing so.

4. Questions however may well be asked about study in *groups*: why is it that the S.C.M. so much emphasises study groups? Part of the answer is that education is a process of give and take between persons, of the exercise of the mind in the fellowship of a community. In the university, however, there is far too much "given" by the few and "taken" by the many. The heart of a study group is the common commitment of a small group of people of different backgrounds, temperaments and intellectual opinions to help one another to grow in the understanding and living of the Christian faith. A study group implies the willingness to spend some time in preparation, so that one comes with one's convictions and questions to some extent sorted out, and it implies the willingness to talk and thus make one's own contribution, to listen and thus to learn from others, and to act on whatever new truth is revealed to the group. A study group is thus quite different from a lecture or a tutorial, or a discussion group. Many of our so-called study groups are in fact discussion groups in which people come without any preparation and say the first thing that comes into their head which soon gets boring for everybody. And while there is a place for such groups in evangelism, there are no substitutes for a real study group which is a cell within the whole life of the S.C.M. branch, and in which perhaps the only real education which a Christian will receive as a result of his university course will take place.

### *Three concluding points*

1. Within the university it is the task of the S.C.M. to present the whole Gospel to the whole university. We must accept this fact not in a spirit of boasting, but of humility at the vast range of our task and the extent to which we often merely nibble at it.

2. One of our most urgent tasks is to produce from the S.C.M. those who are qualified to take on university jobs, as lecturers, tutors and wardens of halls of residence. The influence of Christians on the teaching staff is very small in most modern universities and with the expansion of university education which is taking place in many countries the urgency of Christians being available to fill university jobs is apparent.

3. The liturgy of the mind which is the main part of the reasonable service of the Christian (Rom. 12: 1-2) student must be seen as his particular contribution to the building up of the whole Church. If Christian students do not bring the service of a trained mind to the building up of the Body of Christ in love there is no other group which can. We ought to have a sense of the joy of serving our Lord with our minds, of using our intellectual gifts for Christ, but there is no joy without a cross, and we can be assured that there is much intellectual pain in store for use as we wrestle with the doubts and perplexities of our bewildered contemporaries, Christian and non-Christian. The neat, tidy, simple answer is not likely to be ours in our generation, but we are called to out-think the "science falsely so called" of the modern world and to lead those who have been misled by it to the foot of the Cross. There we shall not find an immediate answer to every problem of faith and life, but we shall face the right direction and be filled with confidence in the God Who went to such lengths to bring mankind back to Himself.

# **The Problem of History for the Christian**

P. BRATSIOTIS

The problem of history (i.e., facts, the aim and the sense of history), is one of our greatest problems today. There is much confusion in this field, which is caused by the various non-Christian philosophies and theories of history, and especially by the materialistic conception of history of marxism. Youth, in particular, is very greatly influenced by this confused interpretation of history. It is, therefore, the duty of Christian professors to help youth to get out of this confusion and to come to know the truth.

The ancient Greeks had a conception of the supernatural in history, but they knew nothing about the sense of history and they hardly thought about the problem of history. "Everything human runs in circles" — that was the chief conception of history for the Greeks. With Zarathustra, the idea of unity in history appears, but it could not develop because Zarathustra's religion lost itself in mythology.

Very few students, and not many professors, know about the important contribution which the Bible and Christianity have made to the real understanding of history. It has been recognised by non-theologians, as well as theologians, that the origin of the philosophy of history lies in the Bible. Christian thinkers saw the problem of history and they tried to solve it on the basis of their Bible and of their faith.

*The Old Testament conception of history*

Among the people of the pre-Christian era only the people of Israel had a genuine conception of historical unity. The people of Israel owed its understanding of history to the Bible. The religion of Israel was an historical religion from the very beginning. God appears as the Creator of the world. He created the world and, with the world, He created time and history. He broke eternity by creating the world within time. But He did not leave His creation. He is still active. This is a wonderful conception and we find this thought frequently in the Old Testament, particularly in the prophets. Jesus also expressed it: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work" (John, 5: 17).

For a real understanding of history faith in the providence of God and the unity of the human race is very important. But there are other elements which are important for historical thought in the Old Testament. God began the history of the whole human race and especially of His own people. "I am your Lord and your God." He is always present in Jewish history. He goes before His people in a pillar of fire. He desires to lead His people to a happy future and therefore has sent them His messengers, the prophets, and promised them the coming of the Messiah. This hope is predominant in the whole history of the Jewish people. (The hope of a saviour dominated the thinking of all pre-Christian peoples.) He comes. This is the principal thought of the whole Old Testament. History has a definite aim and, although the line leading to this aim is not always straight, it is no longer a circle as with the Greeks. The prophets of the Old Testament are the founders of a philosophy of history. Their way of thinking can be expressed in the following words: sin, despair, repentance, and absolution.

*The decisive event of history*

But the real meaning and purpose of history were given to mankind with the New Testament, with the appearance of Christ in the world. He is the Incarnation of the *logos*, of the Word of God. Through Christ God comes into history to save mankind. Through the Incarnation He has brought together time and eternity which had been separated by sin.

The decisive event of world history, the Incarnation, happened at a time which God Himself had decided and prepared. "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law" (Gal. 4 : 4), and, "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets" (Hebrews 1 : 1).

Christ, the incarnated *logos*, is from the human point of view an historical personality and the religion which He founded is an historical one. Christ is not only the centre of world history, but also the only solution to the understanding of world history. He represents the past, the present and the future. The Old Testament, and all history before Christ, were only to prepare for His coming. Not only the *nomos* (the law) was a school-master for Christ as St. Paul has said, but the heathen wisdom also, which is expressed in the broad-minded conception of the ancient Greek Christian authors. We find in the New Testament many more important ideas for the better understanding of history : the high value given to the human soul, the immense enlargement of the historical horizon by the universal character of the Christian religion, and furthermore the great thought of St. Paul : "We are workers together with God". A very important consequence also of this thought is that history is made by the work of men together with God. God is even using evil for higher purposes : "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God..." (Rom. 8 : 28).

There is another important thought, namely that time for the Christian is the servant of eternity. (See Philemon 15.) Christ is leading mankind to a blessed future. The future is already here with His appearance in the world. Therefore the time of the realisation of the Kingdom of Heaven has begun. "The Kingdom of God is among you" (Lk. 17: 21) — not in you, but among you. Christ Himself is the kingdom, as Origen said. He has ascended into Heaven from whence He will come to judge the living and the dead. And yet He remains with us, with those who are His. "I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." He is always with us in His church, which is the realisation of the Kingdom of Heaven (Mt. 13) and even the personification of Christ Himself (Col. 1: 18; Eph. 1: 23, etc.). He is not only the Lord of the church, but the Lord of the whole world — of time; and that means of history. To Him belongs the past, the present and the future. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty" (Rev. 1: 8).

### *The Christian conception of history*

The knowledge of the coming end was never missing in the real church. The true church lived in this hope in the past, is living in it now, and will live in it in future. Where this hope loses its ardour, there faith is also weakened. One of the main characteristics of the Christian conception of history is that our relationship to history is determined by our relationship to Christ. If we have the Christian conception of history, then history is no more a confused medley of facts, a senseless series of wars with short periods of peace, as many people think. But history is also not the concrete development of God's ideas as Hegel thought; nor is it a simple product of economic factors as Marx taught; nor is it God's tribunal as Schiller said. History, accord-

ing to the conception of the New Testament, and especially according to the splendid vision in the Revelation of St. John, is the fight of good against evil, a struggle against the senselessness and the confusion of the world of darkness. It is a struggle of the Kingdom of God against the forces that stand against the Kingdom of God. A struggle that at the end of time will be won by the triumph of God. All good men, sometimes even bad men, are working with God in this struggle, the symbol of which is the Cross. We are workers together with God.

Christians are assured of victory in this struggle. "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith" (I John 5 : 4). This is the victory that makes us free and releases us from sin, and from the fear we feel as we face the future. Life in this world has become an arena of decision by reason of the appearance of Christ in the world. Faith is this decision. It is not only a simple theory or a way of thinking. Faith is not even only a decision, but it is the total giving of ourselves to God and Jesus Christ. It is an enslavement of the Christian, which gives him real freedom and gives sense to his life for himself and for his neighbour. Let me close these few words about a Christian conception of history with Emil Brunner's remark : "only in such a decisive way can we take part in the meaning of history, which Christ has revealed and given to us". Decision means Yes or No. In this critical period of mankind we have, more than ever, to keep this truth constantly in mind ; and we all, especially Christian youth, have to act in accordance with it.

# The University in a Technological Age

M. M. THOMAS

## *The crisis is cultural, not moral*

There is, by common consent, a crisis in the world today, a crisis in which the universities also are involved. And there are as many diagnoses of the crisis as there are thinkers. But I want to preface this article by choosing the one by late Archbishop Temple, which is worked out in greater detail by V. A. Demant, as to my mind truer to realities than many others, namely, that ours is not a moral but a cultural crisis.

The saying goes that all the present ills of the world are due to the fact that man's moral aims have not kept pace with his technological development; that the poverty of moral aims and moral effort are the clue to the diagnostic of our situation. This is historically untrue. Perhaps there has never been a time in the history mankind when men had better intentions and put in more effort to achieve them. The disintegration of the modern world is not due to the poverty of moral aims but to an inability to achieve them. War, for instance, literally "breaks out" against the will and efforts of man to avoid it. The truth is that in every sphere of life, there exists a divorce between the conscious intentions of man and the fears and desires which really move him, thus creating a gulf between human aims and human achievement. What we would, we cannot. While we follow valid human satisfactions we find ourselves denying the consciously perceived meaning of these satisfactions. Even while we would pray for

peace and work for it, deep down we fear peace more than war, because peace denies the basic satisfactions we crave for. Herein is the present crisis revealed as cultural desintegration.

### *The disappearance of culture*

What, then, is an integral culture? Professor W. M. Horton, in an article on Culture in *The Student World*, Second Quarter, 1944, after a study of culture in different parts of the globe, defines it as the integration of the means and ways of living to some consciously held ends and meanings of life. He says: "It is like a wheel, whose hub is religious, whose spokes are what we call the *mores* — the accepted folk-ways and moral customs — and whose rim is constituted by the 'material culture' characteristic of a particular society; that is, the way they feed and clothe and house and transport themselves, and in general deal with their physical environment... In any event, the *centre* of a culture is composed of a cluster of *ends and meanings* for which it lives, grouped around some supreme object of religious trust and devotion which dominates and unifies them; while the *periphery* of a culture is composed of a set of *ways and means* by which it lives. So long as a culture is in a state of health, there is unity, harmony and hierarchical order between the hub, the spokes and the rim. The moral ends of life grow out of the chief end of life, which religion defines. The arts and crafts, music and drama help to express, to exalt, to celebrate the same supreme ends. The political and economic systems are pervaded and controlled by moral ideals and religious meanings (the same which are glorified in art and drama and sacred liturgy) while they also form a bridge between the spiritual and material aspects of culture; for every healthy culture must of course be adapted effectively by a characteristic set of feeding and housing and clothing and travel facilities, to the geographic environment in which it lives, and able to

defend itself, by isolation or diplomacy or by military means if necessary, against the encroachment of other cultures." Today culture both in the Orient and the Occident has disappeared because the hierarchical order of which Horton speaks as the mark of cultural health has broken down everywhere. It is the crisis of today.

Denis de Rougemont, in the same issue of *The Student World*, speaks of the sense of personal vocation in work as the fundamental characteristic of an integral culture. The Oxford Conference of 1937 emphasised the fundamental inability of bringing to man's daily work a sense of vocation as a judgment on modern society. V. A. Demant, in one of his earlier works, *God, Man and Society*, raised the whole relation of work and vocation to the plane of cultural integration when he said that a man's work ordinarily should provide a *living* and be a *service* to his neighbour before it can be his *vocation*. In a healthy culture the work a man does to live will be the means whereby he serves his neighbour and the vocation he lives to do. It is this hierarchical integration of living, service and vocation that has disappeared today. It is the disappearance of culture.

### *Knowledge as value or power ?*

The modern cultural crisis is reflected in the life of the modern university. The opposition between knowledge as power and knowledge as value reveals the participation of the modern university in the cultural crisis of Knowledge is Power — so goes Bacon's dictum, accepted by the majority. Pitted against it is the cry of the minority that knowledge is value and deals in ends and meanings. The question is often discussed which of the alternative definitions of knowledge is true. The very discussion is symptomatic of the crisis of the university. True knowledge is the search after power, which has value, the relation of power to meaning and the realisation of the meaning of power. Knowledge integrates power to its meaning. This is culture — to

relate ways and means by which man lives to meanings and ends for which he should be living. Thus knowledge is culture. John Baillie, in his university pamphlet, says: "We are all familiar with the phrase, Truth for Truth's sake... To say that the world's greatest seekers after truth were motivated by mere curiosity would be as outrageous as to say that they had in mind only utilitarian ends. They were moved rather by the desire to *know how to live*. They wanted to understand the nature of the universe, not just for the sake of understanding it, but in order to know how to adjust themselves to it. Theirs was neither a merely utilitarian nor a merely intellectual quest; it was a profoundly spiritual one."

In the light of this, the whole discussion of "scientific" *versus* "humane" studies reveals only the extent to which desintegration has taken place in the University. The real question is the integration between the sciences and the humanities. Or again, technical training *or* philosophic pursuits? University — utilitarian *or* transcendent? — these and similar alternatives only aggravate the crisis. When there is such a divorce between knowledge as power and knowledge as value, as exists today in the universities, two things happen. Firstly, power takes its own course, unrelated to its own meaning, and becomes demonic. Secondly, conceptual knowledge and art, not being consciously related to the power of which they are meaning, become unconscious reflections of power and power-relations, without any force of their own; they tend to serve either as ideology or as utopia instead of serving as criteria for the judgment of power. Thus even the normative areas of knowledge cease to deal in real norms and values. In this situation knowledge as power is the only valid truth even about the "humane" studies; they cease to be humane and liberal. It is here that Freud, Marx and Nietzsche serve to reveal the truth of the modern university by puncturing the illusions of the transcendence of the realm of our values built up by the normative sciences and liberal

arts. Value must be effective judgment of power or be reflection of power and interest. In short, the opposition between knowledge as power and knowledge as value has only helped the rise of a knowledge which is demonic power. Then, is it not true to say that the truth of the modern university is fascism ?

*What then is the answer ?*

If the crisis in which we are involved is cultural, then the answer must be cultural reintegration. Horton has emphasised the hierarchical nature of healthy culture. The crisis in the Orient as well as in the Occident is due to the break up of the hierarchy that existed, which could not actualise within its structure the value and meaning of the new forces released by science and technology ; and any new integration must therefore be an integration between *technological* means and ways by which men live today, and the ultimate realm of meanings and ends for which men must live. The modern age demands an actualisation in terms of cultural integration of *the meaning of the machine* ; and this means the creation of a hierarchy of ends and means for our machine age. "The need to have all the ends of life freshly unified and hierarchically ordered in relation to one chief end" must be clearly emphasised.

I am not asking here for a new scholasticism. Thomism failed to reckon with the new fact of technological forces because the Natural Law it proclaimed was based on a static conception of social nature ; and no schematisation today can do justice to the dynamism of the situation we are in. Nevertheless, we can seek for relevant "middle axioms", as they have been called.

This raises the whole question of the relation of Church to culture. Space does not permit the writer to do anything more than briefly state his position. If the Kingdom of God is the ultimate realm of meaning, which alone can integrate life, we should recognise the fact that there is no final culture or cultural integration

in this world. On the other hand, we are rejecting God's will for society, if we do not recognise that the Church, to which is given the Kingdom, is the bearer of culture, in so far as it is the Church, that is, in so far as it does not totally integrate itself with any culture. We have no answer as Christians to the cultural crisis unless we believe that the orientation of a culture to the transcendent Church may become the basis of a relative integration. In this sense Christians should affirm that the Church is in reality the bearer of a new integrated technological culture.

### *The function of the university*

In this task of cultural integration, what is the function of the university?

"Ideally", says Paul Tillich, "education should be introduction into this Church (the Assembly of God, latent and potential), the interpretation of its meaning and the communication of its power. Such education would embrace humanistic, scientific and technical elements. But it would provide meaning and cohesion for them all." This is well said. But it requires quite an amount of common prayerful thinking to see how the interpretation of the Church's meaning and the communication of the Church's power can be witnessed to in the university, which by its very nature is limited to and bounded by what may broadly be called the pursuit of rational truth. The writer of this article submits that the best way to do so is to recognise the rôle of reason, as we do that of law, as schoolmaster to Christ and His Church.

In an integral culture with a tradition to pass on, the university "must produce the type and it must provide for growth beyond the type" (Hocking). But today, when we are in a cultural crisis, the university must bear values for the new cultural type. It must prepare for the emergence of the technological culture. Therefore the function of the university is to be the

creator and bearer of a new integrated hierarchy of rational values, wherein the rational ends for which man in this age strives may find their cohesion and meaning. The university should thus commit itself not only to pursue relevant rational ends, but to relate those ends to one another in a hierarchical unity. It is only in this way that "the education for tomorrow" can "bring an end to the cleavage between work or useful activity and the blossoming of spiritual life and disinterested joy in knowledge and beauty" (Maritain). It is well to recall at this moment what President Robert Hutchinson said in his address at Yale in 1940. "The crucial error is that of holding that nothing is any more important than anything else, that there can be no order of goods and no order in the intellectual realm. There is nothing central and nothing peripheral, nothing primary, nothing basic and nothing superficial... In such conditions, the course of study goes to pieces because there is nothing to hold it together." Nothing more need be said to justify the university becoming the creator and bearer of a hierarchy of rational values.

### *A hierarchy of rational values*

The writer is speaking as one who looks at the university from outside; and he can only suggest a few positive elements of that hierarchy of rational values, which the university must bear, hoping that this will give rise to a discussion along these lines in the University Commission of the Federation.

For this purpose, he would like to borrow from Paul Tillich the three categories of reason he has mentioned in a different context and add to them two more of his own, thus making a hierarchy of five rational ends for the university. Thus a university should be the bearer of 1. technical reason; 2. planning reason; 3. revolutionary reason; 4. imperative reason, and 5. bounded reason. Let me explain briefly.

1. *Technical Reason.* A university should help to develop the technique of production — the development of the machines, as well as providing “hands” and “engineers” for the machines. This is a very utilitarian end; but is it not a rational end, which is basic to all the other rational ends of culture? If Horton’s definition of culture is accepted, then it is. When liberal educationalists speak of the utilitarian tendency of the modern university with distaste, I, for one, feel it as a sure illustration of the disappearance of culture. If the integration of culture is to mean the actualisation of the meaning of technology, as I believe it should, then this so-called utilitarian end must be taken up as a valid rational end for the university. It means that there is a sense in which a university is a college for *technical training* and industrial research. Maritain says: “The utilitarian aspect of education — which enables the youth to get a job and make a living — must surely be not disregarded, for the children of men are not made for aristocratic leisure”. Elsewhere he says: “A kind of animal training... undoubtedly plays its part in education”.

But while a university must recognise the rational end of production, develop techniques and provide technicians for the machines, it ceases to be a university, if this rational end does not become the means to a higher end, namely that of providing for the technician a *professional education*. This means teaching him the rôle of his profession and professional technique in the complex organism of industrial relations. If technical training gives a mechanistic view, it must be taken up into the organic view of professional education and given meaning.

2. *Planning Reason.* The university should provide society with *social engineers*, the planners of society. This arises out of the cultural need of political, economic and social ordering, and of politicians. Under this comes the aim of the university to produce men capable of engineering and organising men as “categories” and “functions” of

economic, social and political interests, through the teaching of the theory and practice of rational social engineering. The professionally educated man and the scientist must work within the context of the work of the politician, the planner and engineer of the organic and organisational aspects of life, and make a response to politics ; and it is only when that response is made that one knows the social meaning of one's profession. Dr. Leighton Yates, of Sheffield University, in his address at the last British Universities Industrial Conference of the British S.C.M., said : "The need since the atomic bombs, of providing their *raison d'être* had caused scientists to move along two different lines, based very broadly on Marxism and on the Christian Ethic. It is as yet too early to tell which line will develop, but some thought it possible to combine both." This development is a recognition by scientists that planning reason is the *raison d'être* of technical reason.

3. *Revolutionary Reason.* The university must provide education in the rational principle of justice as a principle of judgment of politics and planning. In other words, the university should provide the prophets of revolutionary reason who would, in the name of what is due to man as man, proclaim the criteria of political planning and the rational ends of social engineering. In this light, *humane education*, which inspires in man a passion for humanity and justice is the one task of the university which gives meaning to all the other rational ends already mentioned. I am not equating humane education with "humane" studies, though humanities can contribute much to humane education, if a radical revision is made in the teaching and content of the humanities. Art, literature, philosophy, etc., are today so unrelated to the common man's life that they tend to be ideological reflections of technical reason and nothing more. The demand of the university should be that every poet, musician, painter and sculptor, every literary genius and philosopher should be a prophet of revolutionary reason, by consciously making his work

an expression of humanity at the service of justice. It is only in this way that the university can be what Dorothy Emmet calls "the intellectual conscience" of humanity. "The common human experience", says L. A. Reid, "is the raw material for the humanities ; or when interpreted through the vision of poets or other great men, it is the stuff of which the humanities are made". If this is so, the humanities are only expressing their true nature when they inspire passion for justice and humanity, wherein lies the meaning of planning reason. Here is the significance of progressive literature and people's art, condemned today as utilitarian by the ivory-tower artists and literary men, keen on maintaining the *status quo*.

The relation of the poet to the politician, if they are both true to their vocation, must be very intimate and productive of creative tensions. I have in mind as the true relation the one that existed between poet Rabindranath Tagore and Mahatma Gandhi, the politician. Tagore was the poet of Indian Nationalism, but always kept Indian nationalist politics under judgment. Was he not expressing himself as a poet, when he violently condemned Japanese Militarism ?

4. *Imperative Reason*. Allied with the rational principle of justice as its meaning, stands the higher rational end of the university — *to pursue truth for truth's sake*. Some might feel that, in putting this at the top of a hierarchy which includes utilitarian and social values also, the very idea of "truth for truth's sake" is denied. Certainly, yes, if truth is defined as something separate from the life of the man working as hands for the machine, from the life of the politician and of the citizen involved in political choices, and from the prophet's passion for justice and humanity. But then you make of no effect the definition of truth as the meaning of life. Utilitarianism is not a total denial of truth because it has a meaning for human life. If, therefore, we define truth to include the truth of utilitarianism also, we give a new meaning to the slogan "truth for truth's sake". I submit

that the slogan is meaningless except in our hierarchy of rational values. Within the hierarchy, it proclaims the categorical imperative of rational truth as the ultimate *raison d'être* of the pursuit of all rational values, including technical reason. Herein we affirm a motive beyond the utilitarian and social motives to follow the utilitarian and social truths. Imperative reason is a principle whereby the challenge of objective rational truth is maintained as ultimately the only sound basis of rational freedom, which is the meaning of rational justice. Browning's Grammarian dealing with his enclitic *de* just before his death, because truth challenges him, is the most cultured product of an integral university.

5. *Bounded Reason.* Lastly the university must bear the rational truth that reason has boundaries, and is not unconditioned. The university must hold to the rational truth that the I-It relation, which it seeks to know, is *bounded by the I-Thou relation*. The *existence* of the I-Thou relation, though not its content, is rationally known and must be proclaimed by the university as the apex of its hierarchy of rational values. It is thus that it points to a personal reality beyond itself by which it is bounded, and reason becomes the preparation for the preaching of the gospel and an introduction to Christ and His Church.

It is not suggested here that the university has any right to say to reason, "Thus far and no further". The world of I-Thou is not a spatial but a dimensional boundary for the world of I-It; and these worlds interpenetrate at every point. On the one hand, even the ideas of God and neighbour have an It-aspect which is the right of reason to investigate and know; thus a science of history, a science of religion, or even a sociology of God is within bounds for reason. On the other hand, the God who chooses and acts, and the neighbour who speaks, stand outside the very subject-object dimension of reason and can be known only by the personal answer of faith, hope and love. Even the heavens and earth

have a Thou-aspect in that they declare the glory of God and can be a sacramental means of Grace for the man of faith.

### *Truth is existential*

It is the character of all truth that it belongs to historical existence. Therefore the university cannot know and be a bearer of rational truths unless it gives up its spectator-attitude and becomes a participant. This requires that technical reason should ally itself with machines and workers in factories. Planning reason and revolutionary reason should concern themselves not only with teaching students ideologies of politics and justice, but should lead the students into student participation in politics for justice through student organisations ; and they must learn the prophetic core and content of "humane" studies in this struggle. Imperative reason must find its test in the ability of the students to maintain a rational independence over the common opinion of the student community and the student organisations in which they participate. And above all reason can remain bounded reason only as students listen to the Word of God, and are continually challenged to enter and live in a student Christian community. Without such active participation in historical existence, both political and religious, the rational values will remain only an idea and will not become existential reality for the students of the university.

### *Facing totalitarianism*

A hierarchy of rational ends can be maintained by the university if no rational end in the hierarchy claims to be the *total* meaning of the university. It is such totalitarianism that is the root of the crisis today and will be the peril of any new attempt at cultural integration. There is something demonic in every rational end that makes it claim the totality of the university for itself.

Especially today the technical and planning reasons do tend to claim the whole university for themselves; and always rationalism will oppose the validity of the bounded reason as a rational value. Therefore tensions and conflicts cannot be avoided. Knowing reason as a schoolmaster to Christ, it is the task of the Student Christian Movement in a university to be in the tensions and conflicts of the university, proclaiming the hierarchy of rational ends to students and professors through all rational organisations of students and professors, fighting rationalism at every turn until the S.C.M. is driven to the catacombs. But note that catacombs are not a place of refuge, and the S.C.M. has no right to go there until it is driven there. And when it is in the catacombs it should still bear within its life the rational values that will unite the university and integrate culture after the storm. Is the World's Student Christian Federation able to face this task?

## Prayer and the Christian Student

T. R. MILFORD

When the disciples said to our Lord: "Teach us to pray", He did not give one rule for the fishermen and another for Matthew, and a third for the political-minded Simon Zelotes. He gave them all one model, and that model has served all varieties of Christians ever since. Why, then, should there be anything peculiar to say about Prayer and the Christian *student*? Students also are human; why should they not pray just as other human beings do?

There is no reason at all; and that is the first thing to be said. In fact, to think anything else is to fall into the error of specialisation and departmentalisation in the one place where it is most essential that we should be whole. In prayer we meet God as members of Christ, in Whom there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female, educated nor simple. Prayer is the place where the partial people, the hands and brains which we are in our functional relations, are restored to the wholeness of the children of God. That is why, in general, the worship of the Church takes you where you live, and in your home setting, rather than in the other settings where you meet only with others of your own kind. Neither "student services" nor any other special kind of services are a substitute for the general worship of the Church.

Let us think, then, first of Christian prayer as such, and then of the special "liturgy" of the Christian student.

*Christian prayer*

Prayer in its fullest sense is the whole of our intercourse with God. Think of Christians as two-ended beings, living Jacob's Ladders, connected at the top with God (where we are citizens of heaven, raised already with Christ from the dead, and seated with Him in the heavenly places). Your life there is a hidden life, (hid with Christ in God) and you are hardly aware of it. But you are at home there, in your own peculiar mansion in the Father's house, whenever you choose to look in. But you are also in this world, and it is God's will for you that that should be so (I pray not that thou shouldest take them from the world); and sometimes, in your concentration on the business which is given you down here, you ought to forget, with your conscious attention, that there is any other world at all.

You *are* the Ladder, and you travel along it; we cannot avoid the ambiguity of the picture. And you are linked also, in a living network, with all your fellow Christians in the Body of Christ, the living Vine, the Way who in Himself connects heaven and earth.

The pulses of His life, flowing up and down, are the prayers of Christ in His Church. Somewhere near the top is pure worship and unmediated contemplation, where God as He is in Himself is all in all, and even what He has done and is doing in this world falls out of sight. And at the other end is the work which is done for Christ and in Christ, where *laborare* and *orare* coalesce. In between is the double motion of oblation and petition. Oblation offers to God all that goes on down here, for His redemption, forgiveness and acceptance; the whole of our natural life in this way becomes part of our Lord's offering and His and our life upon the Cross (for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth). And petition holds out the empty hand, ready to receive the gift of grace, in the natural life redeemed and given back. The same old thing comes

back ; but He has touched it, and if you look, you will see that the dull old job, the familiar trouble, the worry that you know so well, is marked with His Cross, which makes it holy. That is often the only, and quite sufficient, answer to your prayer.

No doctrine is alive until it has been prayed through. Until then it is only one of a set of intellectual counters which you can arrange and rearrange in more or less pleasing patterns. But equally, prayer has no form until it is thought about and organised by doctrine. That is why the Bible and the classical forms of worship are indispensable to Christian devotion. The strongest prayer is the most definitely doctrinal. But thirdly, no prayer has substance until it is filled out by particular acts of obedience.

There is nothing quantitative about all this. A very little prayer, if that is all you have time for, will sanctify an intolerable deal of drudgery. A little bit of practical faithfulness will fill out and save from selfishness a day-long programme of devotion. The harassed mother of four spares a moment in the morning, the enclosed nun does a bit of weeding or mending, and all is well. Equally, a very little theology, but that good, will save life from futility and prayer from silliness.

### *The liturgy of the Christian student*

And now for the special liturgy of the Christian student. It is not the whole of your reasonable service, but it is a part, and an essential part. As a student you are offering your mind to God, as an instrument through which the Body of Christ can deal with the world. In particular, it is your function to be competent in thought and act at your own special point, where your own brain is brought to work. Does it seem odd that Christ cannot think about French literature or Physical Chemistry except through such people as you ? At all events, you must agree that He cannot express or make effective in the world any thoughts on such things, except

through such people as you ; nor can He build, organize or heal except through Christian engineers, administrators and doctors. A Church incompetent and inarticulate means a Christ dumb and bound. Your competence is to provide Him with a mouth and hands, there where you are, or there where He will send you.

I think you will get further towards making sense of your studies along these lines than by trying to think out the relation of what you are reading to everything else. In the disintegrated state of the University (and of knowledge and civilisation in general), you will have to go on in faith that things do ultimately fit together and make sense. I do not think you can expect to see just exactly how they do ; nor that there is much to be gained by being in a great hurry to point out exactly the sort of nonsense that they make. This is where you will bear your part of the "tortured mind" of which Professor Hodges writes in his contribution to the University Pamphlets.

There is a real strain, there ought to be a real strain, for Christians who are scientists (biologists particularly), medicals, historians, yes, for Christians, practically whatever they are reading, in thinking honestly about their own subjects and their implications, and also about their Christian faith, and its implications. They just do not fit. It is as if exploring over the surface of the globe (as it were from the triangle Jerusalem-Athens-Rome) each of the parties has lost sight of the others and of the starting point, and each continues to use the rectangular frame of reference which works well enough in its own neighbourhood, but their extrapolations do not fit with one another.

That theologian too works out his schemes as well as he can, and tries to fit his frame of reference on to the world described by these other studies. He too must feel the strain ; for neither he nor anyone else can say exactly what is the projection of the Holy Spirit upon this plane or that. And therefore our confidence is not in our philosophy, or in our theology as such ; but in the living

Christ, and in the living God, Whose world it is. Somewhere, you, each of you, should be taking this strain, of living by faith, in 1947.

### *Taking the strain*

One place where you should be taking it is in daring really to meet non-Christians, both face to face and in their books. Do not avoid, in Hall or Common Room, the people who make you feel uncomfortable, because you do not know what to say to them, and because you think they think you fools. And when I say meet them, I mean really meet, really feel the weight of their doubt. Do not just be ready with a quick and snappy answer. Dare really to feel what it is that makes them doubt. It may partly be something in you, if not in your character, then in the way you hold your faith!

This openness to risk is quite compatible with decision, though sometimes you may be driven back on your defences. And when you are, how solid they turn out to be! It is not your own conviction, not your own religious experience on which you rely (a poor foundation that for any superstructure of world-interpretation!) but the witness of the Church, the authority of the saints, and finally the word of Christ Himself. Who is more likely to be right, young X across the table with, to be just, his backing of Huxleys and Russells or who you will, or these whom you call to your aid, Christ and His saints? I know whom I have trusted, and I have enough by now of first-hand knowledge of what they speak of, to know that there, with them, is life, and that there, when I am most myself, I am truly at home.

Is this then prayer? Indeed it is. For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against ideologies, against predominant tendencies, against the materialistic sceptical spirit of our age. Wherefore take up the whole armour of God.

## THE EDITOR'S TRAVEL DIARY

*"The summer is ended, and we are not saved". The cry of the people, which the prophet overheard, must often be echoed by those who have been responsible for religious conferences! It is so hard, when all is over, to know what has been accomplished, and so easy to fall into the faithlessness of trying to find immediate results. But one thing is certain : that the series of events in which the Federation was involved in Europe in July and August had about them a coherence and purposiveness which was more difficult to detect in the previous summer.*

### A University Conference at Bossey

*Greatly daring, we called a meeting of professors, perhaps the first of its kind in the history of the Federation. Little need be said about the programme in The Travel Diary because the whole issue of The Student World is concerned with it. But it may be noted in passing that professors in conference are very like students — difficult to get started on time when the sun shines on the meadows of Bossey and the Lake is cool, and just as anxious to know which is to be their free afternoon for visiting Geneva. Sometimes the discussion was highly technical, sometimes it laboured, but quite often it sparkled. There can be no doubt whatever that the University Commission of the Federation is away to a fine start, not only in the minds of a few theologians, clerical and lay, whose delight is to hunt "liberal rationalism" from all the coverts of the campus, but in the minds of a growing group of Christian university teachers, who are grateful for an opportunity of discussing their problems with one another and of building a new conspectus of the university.*

*It was very good for a few professional Christian workers to share in the discussion. The university too often becomes for them*

*simply the scene of their labours, the place where new committees have to be formed and new programmes drawn up, or, at best, where a few students are encouraged to look beyond their books or games into the reaches of eternal life. Just as the university man may overlook the claims of the Church, so the churchman may overlook the claims of the university. To one delegate, at any rate, the Bossey University Conference brought fresh wonder at the whole stately conception of the universitas magistrorum et scholarium, not because it is always evident in the university of today, but because there are intimations of it whenever there is good talk amongst university men. It is a certain noble nostalgia which is the saving grace of the university, rather than an enthusiasm for relevance to a technological age. But here the diarist and the general secretary are in danger of being at variance!*

#### And the Executive Committee

*The General Committee meeting of 1946 naturally left a good many loose ends, and the Executive Committee met this year in Bossey to tie them. The tentative plans of the larger meeting had begun to take shape, and thirty people, meeting for three days, were really in a position to settle complicated questions, and to review the work of the Federation in its conferences and its study commissions. In 1946 the Federation was collecting itself to start a new post-war journey; in 1947 it was en route.*

*The most fascinating session, as ever, was the survey of movements. We found ourselves learning about the Middle East, and once again hearing encouraging news about Latin America. But the high-light was surely the map of Africa, drawn on the black-board by Eric Tikili of the Bantu Section of the South African Movement. His arrows indicating directions and journeying-time to his friends in other movements showed at once a consciousness of geographical distance, and nearness within the Federation. This same sense of distance and nearness was also conveyed by the fortunate arrival of Horst Bannach from Germany, just across the frontier, on a visit which had been timed for another meeting long past, but which official delays had not unhappily made to coincide with the Executive! Physical and political barriers alike have a way of revealing the strength of the Federation's will to unity.*

## Via Denmark

*The six days of International Student Service and World Student Relief meetings in the fine modern setting of Aarhus University were certainly strenuous. I.S.S. conferences always seem to produce a plethora of ideas for the Assembly to develop later, and we had the elaborate budgeting of our relief funds to work out. There is no doubt that I.S.S. is once again expanding geographically not least through Malcolm Adiseshiah's efforts in South Eastern Asia, and one naturally asks whether the rather indefinable spirit of I.S.S. is capable of expanding so widely. But the hesitation is unjustified. Constructive human relationships are never easy to define but they are capable of rapid multiplication when the right setting for them is found. I never was more conscious of the value of I.S.S. than when Roman Catholics, Protestants and Jews, representatives of Eastern and Western Europe, of Asia and America, once again sat round a common table, thrashing out their differences with great candour, yet held together by a common interest in the abiding function of the university and not by the passing relevance of a political creed.*

*In 1946 there had been some people who felt that World Student Relief might be coming to an end. In 1947 we all saw more clearly the magnitude of the post-war tasks, and the need to humanise and dramatise the contacts between giving and receiving universities. This distinction indeed is beginning to disappear. The insistence that every national community must contribute in some way to the main fund for assistance, and the illustration of ingenious methods of barter, as well as of imaginative giving out of poverty, were very encouraging. From Poland, from Roumania, from Germany, from China, from Burma and from the great mass of those students who have lost their political status, or do not care to claim it, came poignant stories of human need, and we knew that all our efforts would only meet an infinitesimal fraction of that need. The Federation gave the original impulse to this service a quarter of a century ago, and it is now one of four bodies working together with equal status; but there is no reality in the student world more fundamentally Christian than this. The peculiar function of those of us who bear the name of Christ in this work of cooperative charity is surely to claim the promise that once made the loaves and fishes adequate for the requirements of a multitude.*

## To Oslo

*When I visited Oslo in October 1945 to recruit Andreas Schanke for the Federation staff, I little thought that 1947 would see a World Conference of Christian Youth taking place there. But it was a far more remarkable contrast to sit one glorious evening overlooking the fjord beside the fountain in the garden of our principal host, in company with the German delegation, and be reminded that the place where we met had been a centre of the Norwegian Resistance. This invitation to supper was characteristic of the quiet dignity of the Norwegians, which seemed to reach its height when Bishop Berggrav was content to shorten the opening session by reducing his speech to, "Welcome to Norway". We did receive a profoundly Christian welcome from the people of the country, and perhaps to many delegates that was the most creative experience.*

*My mind was always slipping back to the British S.C.M. Quadrennial Conference of 1933! Almost a score of Norwegians came to visit Scotland then, and their leader was an infectious enthusiast, named Alex Johnson. Up the Castle hill of Edinburgh I pushed a barrow with the conference papers and beside me pushed a tall, rather taciturn, Englishman, called Francis House, who believed that once you had taken on a job, you never stopped till you had seen it through. With Alex as chairman and Francis as secretary I never doubted that Oslo would go through with a swing! But there were so many people involved from coordinators and experts and leaders to charming stewardesses who, in spite of the heat, always seemed to be cool and smiling in Norwegian dress, that the credit of the success of the conference — and it was a success — went to several hundred people.*

*In what way was it a success? We shall know truly, as we did after Amsterdam, in half a dozen years' time. But we can make some guesses. It was indescribably hot in the hall when the main addresses were delivered; the Bible study and discussion groups took a long time to get going; indeed at any given moment you could find a lot of reasons why one should never attempt anything at the same time so large and so detailed again. But conferences have a way of settling themselves down to work in spite of the complications of their machinery. And by the time we marched the streets to greet thousands of our Oslo fellow-Christians in the*

*great Sports Stadium, we knew we were an army, and not a rabble. We did not carry banners, and we had no sense of being victors in a triumph. What did we know? We knew that all things were possible with God — yes, even that Dutch and Indonesians, Czechs and Germans, representatives of Western imperialism and of resurgent Asia, Anglo-Saxons and Continentals, “modernists” and “conservatives”, and so on through all the gamut of our human differences, could be made conscious of common sin and thus begin to understand the meaning of a common salvation. We talked much about the Lordship of Christ, but far more important was the sense of His hand upon us, in chastisement, in consolation and in sustaining power. We went away from Oslo with few of our problems solved but in the renewed assurance that God lives and reigns.*

*And Lundsberg to finish —*

*The morning train from Oslo carried rows of semi-recumbent forms — all that was left of the W.S.C.F. delegation after ten days of long hours and concentrated religion! I wondered as I passed along the corridor whether these dry bones would ever live! But by the next morning in the sun-flecked shade of the birches round the lake at Lundsberg a student conference, more than two hundred strong, had come miraculously to life. Martin Lindstrom, Birgit Rodhe and all our Swedish friends had done everything we asked them, and half as much again, for our comfort. It was a very happy conference. No wonder some of the delegates began to think that Lundsberg meant more to them than Oslo. But really it was a tribute to Oslo that this should be so. Without the stimulus and the fellowship of Oslo, Lundsberg would have taken several days to get into its stride. As it was it started at full speed and never flagged for a full week.*

*The programme had been prepared by correspondence amongst a group of students, who had been at Gwatt in 1946. It fitted most happily into the framework of Oslo, so that at Lundsberg the general became the particular, and our vision was brought into the focus of the life in the university. There were two outstanding features — the Bible study groups of six, in which everyone had a chance to lead, and the two sets of commissions upon concerns in the life of the Federation. Last year we were troubled about democracy,*

but this year we found some of its roots. Thirty little knots of people under trees, out in the meadow, or even in a boat swinging at its painter, really made the word of God their own possession, and the epistle "to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons" became "an epistle to the movements in forty countries, with their secretaries and leaders". Then in the commission periods, groups of students made their contribution to different sides of the Federation's life in a way which will certainly affect its policy in the next year or two.

I have not written about the Holiday Chalet at Grindelwald, or the Work Camp at Bièvres, because, alas even an editor cannot be omnipresent! But I have heard enough to know that I missed a great deal, for it is often the smaller meetings which have the most universal character.

Another summer ended — for which to give God thanks!

R. C. M.

---

## PAGES FROM A GERMAN TRAVEL DIARY

---

### Democracy

A strong and rather cold wind is blowing. The spring is several weeks late but the sun shines graciously today. There must be some sort of a school in the vicinity. Little girls are passing by with knapsacks on their backs. One of them munches an apple. That must be an apple from a private garden carefully preserved all through the winter; there are no apples to be had on the ordinary market. Or perhaps it is an UNRRA apple? ... The school-girls all look cheerful. Just like children without worries anywhere on the earth. White linen is wafted in the breeze in one of the backyards. The picture looks normal and everyday-like and for the moment it is hard to imagine that only two years ago there was a terrible war and a terrible breakdown. The children have disappeared. Their mothers appear on the balconies to air bedding and what not. The old German Sauberkeit! I think that this

*Sauberkeit* and sense of order is one of the reasons, perhaps the main reason, why you see here in Heidelberg comparatively few people in ragged clothes. The housewives mend and wash and turn old pieces of clothing and the result really looks sauber.

This is a people of great order and sense of duty and faithfulness but also a people of certain greedy habits and rigid and unrelenting mass thinking. It is a dangerous thought but I sometimes wonder whether the present scarcity of food supplies is not a kind of education for the people who did not believe that they could exist beneath a certain calory rate. Perhaps it is a necessary education for a people which listened to Gœring four years ago and applauded these words of his : "Other peoples might have to starve, Germany will never starve". But on the other hand when people are suffering we have to help them whatever interpretation we might employ in defining their situation...

If you want to conquer a country from within, you don't need in the first place high-sounding idealistic phrases. What you need is food and possibilities of building private little cottages for the people. The Germans would be easily won over in this way, like any other people, I suppose. It is another question how deep this change would go and how close to the roots of the evil. But this is undoubtedly the way that simple little people everywhere argue : "Food and houses — good system. Little food and no houses — bad system". It seems that the way to democracy goes through the stomach.

The Americans here in the zone talk about democracy as though it were something which most of them cherish on some other ground, for instance on some idealistic ground entirely disentangled from the concrete realities of everyday life. This is a big mistake, I believe. And that is why their teaching sounds rather hollow to the Germans. Practically they base the democracy of the North American continent on exactly the same material argumentation and judge the value of a theoretical system from how it works materially and practically. When they say to the Germans that democracy is something much deeper than food and housing, the Germans could be tempted to ask : "Is that why you take our milk for your own families ?" It is true that a waft of high spirit breezes through American history, a highly idealistic trend, a trend which Germany has not revealed in her history. But on the practical level, in the mind of the common

*man-in-the-street* a system is always judged and assessed by its practical workings, its results, its capacity of producing food and housing for the people...

About U.N.R.R.A. and the army on the one hand and the German population on the other, I must say: two worlds. In world number one prevails an atmosphere of ignorance as to the living conditions and national character of the Germans. It is self-willed, self-imposed ignorance. In the other world, a grey and rather hapless world, democracy is criticised on the basis of the attitude and behaviour of the occupational forces. In this world people say: "This is not democracy" and "we were promised democracy but so far we have not seen anything of it." It is a world where people, spiritually if not literally, walk about with a pouting mouth as if they had expected to have democracy served to them ready-made on a tray.

In both worlds there are lots of misconceptions and a great deal of unwillingness to penetrate below the surface. And so it will probably go on till the last day of the occupation and in both these worlds people will part without having forgotten anything and without having learned anything.

### Political education

I met an American University officer. He seemed to be a cultured man. It was the first visit by a W. S. R. representative. He wanted to see more of the representatives in the future. We spoke among other things about politics and the colonel said that the students at the Heidelberg University, like in all universities in the American zone, are not allowed to form political clubs within the student corps, but no one can prevent them from belonging to a political party, of course, he said. He had had no indications that students were taking any part in the new clandestine nazi units which are being discovered by the M.P.s at present. The students, the colonel said, stick pretty strictly to their studies and are even slightly afraid of politics. The colonel thought this was a good sign. I am not in complete agreement with him. Such an attitude towards the problems of society does not improve the social awareness and the community responsibility among students. After all, they are going to be the leaders of Germany. The colonel said

that purely academic societies, clubs and groups were permitted, for instance clubs for theological students, or students of science, or students of history, in other words, professional groups. The authorities have nothing against clubs which are kept on a purely professional level. There is thus an apparent lack of political and social education at the universities of the American zone. I believe that the Americans hereby — in all their democratic zeal — are committing a serious blunder. The German students are afraid of putting their names on a party list, but this fright or hesitation should not be encouraged too much. The Americans apparently intend to send out into the professional field German graduates who know their business well but nothing about the wider context in which this business stands, be it the profession of a clergyman or of a doctor or of a lawyer.

In the British zone political clubs are permitted in the universities, I have been told. I believe that such a move is wiser and more realistic. The colonel defended the step taken by the Americans by saying — but he said it rather waveringly and with a slight question mark, as it were — that they did not want to have activities in the student body governed by politics, which he thought would be the case if political groups existed among the students. He said that the party in majority might then want to pull its weight and push decisions and the university would become governed by politics.

### Life in German cities

I have never been to Frankfurt before. Even if I had, I am sure I would not have recognised the city as it is today. It is shockingly destroyed. There is practically not one undamaged building within a wide circle around the central station. Radiators hang on still standing walls like flags that have suddenly frozen in the wind. The debris has been cleared away from the streets but there are still brick heaps on the side-walks. The tower clock of a church which is otherwise totally destroyed had stopped at five minutes past eleven. German civilians looking like formerly well-to-do middle class people with rather high pretensions of comfort pulled their luggage on low home-made hand-carts which have to be lifted and lowered at each curb. People look very tired, pale, apathetic. I have the feeling that people in big cities have suffered more than

*in small ones like Heidelberg. Some people seem to have rather good clothing but a large percentage of the clothes one sees is threadbare. The poor people have apparently run short of clothing for you see quite a few who practically wear rags. There is an indescribable gloom in the railway stations and streets of large German cities. All of these humans' thoughts seem grey. I foresee that if the food situation does not improve very soon, a terrible catastrophe will be the result — not a revolution or a large uprising, people are far too exhausted and passive and starved for that, but an appalling increase in the death rate. In most cases the official autopsy will be given quite normal causes for the deaths, but starvation will really be the reason...*

*Scores of young men and young boys loaf around in the vicinity of the station. Theoretically there is said to be no unemployment, but the fact that these boys and men are standing or sauntering around here all day long speaks against this assertion. It is like this, I believe, that most people have put their names on the lists of the employment bureaux, have been given work in certain firms for rubble-clearing. Many people are just attached to some private persons who want to have a cottage erected in the outskirts and who on this account need people to transport bricks from ruins. The boys do not take these jobs seriously and so here they are, casting envious glances at occupation personnel coming out of and walking into the ruined station building...*

*I am in Göttingen. The air of an old university town is still there. No buildings are damaged. You see a lot of young men in the streets. The University courses are in full swing. I had expected people to look healthier from my previous experience of Heidelberg, as it seems that small towns offer more possibilities for getting some extra food in the American zone. But here in the British zone rationing seems to have been harder, and I find that the inhabitants of Göttingen look very pale and very tired. Elderly people especially look emaciated...*

*I saw a poster on a wall today. One of the youth groups of Labour Union announced a meeting for young people. An address was going to be given on the subject: Hat die deutsche Jugend noch eine Zukunft? (Has the German Youth still a future?)...*

*There is an apparent lack of courtesy from the side of post-office agents, railway officials and shop-clerks. You felt like a "wet dish-*

rag" after a snubbing reply to a query, and you are inclined to snub back when all of a sudden you remember that you have eaten very well during the winter, and up to this very day, whereas these people have existed on vegetable soup and bread. Yet, I have met some "public servants" who have the strength to be kind and courteous on 1000 calories; for instance, the friendly police-man who directed me in the dark at Heidelberg, although he was off duty and on his way home. Such things are admirable. I hope he was not helpful only because he thought I was a compatriot. After all, it is easier to be kind to those who share in the same tribulations.

### Visiting a pastor friend

I arrived in a tiny village. My friend works here as a pastor. His house is largely brickbuilt, one part occupied by some sort of stables in the usual manner of central Germany. The house is as a whole meant to be the abode of the pastor but now three refugee families are occupying various parts of it and only two rooms are left for the vicar's family.

It was a great joy to see my friend the pastor again. He is devoted to his work in the parish, and the sermons I listened to were good, and followed with attention by the parishioners. We discussed the problem of German guilt. He said that he is never able to subscribe to the Confessional idea of a collective guilt. He felt that Niemöller had made a mistake by publishing his statement about the collective guilt of all Germans. Guilt, my friend says, can be understood only in a religious context, is a religious term, and if taken out of this context, it becomes meaningless. What Niemöller did was to deliver an admission of a collective guilt on behalf of all Germans, which was perhaps not designed to be used by politicians, but in fact was used by them. Politicians, said the pastor, very seldom know what guilt in the Christian sense is. They take the words as they stand, without their inner and deeper meaning, and use them as a sort of weapon in their campaigns. My friend agreed that all Christians are united in a common guilt, and that the Germans had to assume the responsibility for a considerable amount of that guilt when looked at from the angle of quantity. However, qualitatively, there can be no difference in guilt, because we cannot be judges of what happens in an invisible world.

## Refugees from the East

*I visited some refugees today — German refugees from the Eastern part of Germany, and from the German minorities in Eastern Europe. In one room and a diminutive kitchen, eight people are living. They try to keep everything clean and they have succeeded. But their clothing was patched and patched again. There is a lot of ingenuity among them, it seems to be inherent. But there was also a great deal of gloom. They all had to suffer, as little parts of a big whole, and when they looked ahead they could not see anyway out of the present misery. The winter had been terribly hard. They had all gathered in the one room round a small stove; the air in that room had been stuffy for months, but they couldn't afford to open the windows. The young men did not have anything to do in the winter time; now they had part-time work on some farms.*

*The village grew from 400 to 1000 after the refugees had arrived. Between nine and ten million such refugees are scattered in the three western zones. They are all a strain on the economy since there is no work to be had for them. But the main calamity in the whole tragedy is the gloom these people spread and the fear of the Russians which they are continually enhancing.*

*I am not likely to forget Belsen or Dachau. My soul has been shaken by these horrors. I read Wiechert's book about Buchenwald and shuddered. I know how my friends in formerly occupied countries have suffered under the iron heel. All this was perpetrated by Germans. No, my appeal is not a sentimental emotional one. It is a practical one. The way of well-organised assistance is the only way now. Our dispersed little efforts are not sufficient. Germany is heading for a terrible catastrophe. The last winter was awful. The next winter, Germans cannot stand on the same rations (1550 calories, official calory rate, is a mythical figure, a display and paper figure; in reality 1000-1200 calories are contained in the food distributed). They will die by the millions, officially from some common disease, in reality of starvation. We in the relief agencies will have to do something on a large scale in a concerted effort. First, a concerted relief drive to ameliorate the worst of this daily agony of mothers and children. Secondly, to represent to the authorities, with detailed suggestions, the necessity of doing something sensible along administration lines.*

## D.P. Students

Today I visited one of the two U.N.R.R.A. hostels for D.P. students. One of the hostels is going to be dissolved very soon. From the 1st April the students of this doomed hostel will have to find accomodation somewhere else. Since U.N.R.R.A. is in the process of closing down they cannot count on any financial support and are entirely thrown back on their own resources. Their own resources, however, are negligible. Some of the students still receive money from relatives in the base camps. Food can still be had through exchange of tobacco, cigarettes or coffee. I suppose that the homeless students will have to resort to the latter means in order to sustain their own lives in the future. U.N.R.R.A. says of course that the students can return to their base camps if they want and that they will be catered for adequately there. But on the other hand that means discontinuance of university studies and the students are by and large not prepared to make this sacrifice. (Of course, the students will get the German ration cards)...

The U.N.R.R.A. officials I have met here say that it was never the intention of U.N.R.R.A. to assume permanent responsibility for the studies of these D.P. students. It was a temporary measure pending a repatriation carried out as soon as possible. Now the political situation of Europe has proved more intricate and complex then the U.N.R.R.A. leaders anticipated in 1945. It has become clear that comparatively few of the displaced persons belonged to the repatriable categories and an entirely new situation has arisen.

a) Besides the small group of those who have chosen to return to their home countries, there are two other groups :

b) D.Ps. who will be integrated with the German society, dependent on the German economic system, and take up work as German citizens. (It is quite another matter what the Germans will say about this proposal. D.Ps. are not at all popular among the Germans for various reasons, firstly because the D.Ps. had some advantages immediately after the war and made the utmost use of these advantages, secondly because the D.Ps. are existing on the black market and are said to destroy German economy, thirdly because the D.Ps. take up 10 % of the places at the German universities).

c) The D.Ps. who want to settle in some non-European country, in South America, Canada, Australia or South Africa which are the countries mentioned in the discussion...

*Voluntary relief agencies still do and will in the future do a great deal in support of the students. Against the above background U.N.R.R.A. officials do not always look only favourably on the work of voluntary agencies. The work of voluntary relief agencies might give the D.Ps. the feeling that their status is after all regarded as permanent or in any case as something where few changes can be expected except emigration. The aid of the voluntary agencies thus tends to go against the repatriation policy which is the leading principle of U.N.R.R.A...*

*I believe that it is extremely difficult to retain the balance between the completely non-attached, non-committal, utilitarian and perhaps also somewhat callous attitude of the U.N.R.R.A. and the somewhat unrealistic and perhaps sentimental attitude of the social workers hereto attached to U.N.R.R.A. I must confess that my sympathies are with the social workers, without losing sight of the following considerations : a) the danger of "thinking with the heart"; b) the fact that after all D.P. students cannot at present go to any foreign country. I believe it is a Christian duty to secure their continued studies.*

#### A Christian student Conference

*The German students at this conference have made a deep impression on me, because of their sincerity and deep-rooted convictions. A new generation of Christian leaders is coming up. Everything has been taken away from them. Many have terrible experiences from the front-lines. Few come from Christian homes; they have little basic knowledge of Christianity, but they have met God in the midst of the deepest spiritual misery. I have listened — deeply moved — to some personal experiences put forth by these students.*

*I think it is true what one of them said : "When one has reached a stage where one can only weep, inwardly or outwardly, God is close and God helps, and His power becomes the only real thing to you". Three things have contributed to this new atmosphere in the Studentengemeinder : a) a complete breakdown of the belief in national-socialist doctrines on the philosophical and religious level ; b) agonizing front-line experiences, long years as soldiers and loss of dear ones, c) a fresh approach to Christianity away from the old Christian terminology. The Christian doctrine being discovered from within whereas in the "between years" the statements of Luther's Catechism were just taken for granted, as a matter of social adaptation.*

BENGT HOFFMAN.

## THE STUDENT WORLD CHRONICLE

### The Political Message of Oslo

*This was one of a series of brief addresses given on the closing day of the World Conference of Christian Youth at Oslo, July, 1947.*

Has Oslo a political message? This question was posed clearly by a delegate the other day when he said: "Some young people of our nation are going to the World Youth Festival in Prague, while some of us Christians have come to Oslo. Prague delegates will certainly return with a definite political message." And he asked: "Will Oslo give us a political message at least as clear and as definite as Prague, if not better?" Other delegates may not have put this question in the same way. Nevertheless, over and over again, it has come up in personal conversation and discussion groups. Has Oslo a political message?

I must confess at the very outset that I for one cannot see in Oslo a political message as strong, clear and definite as that which Prague would give. I came to Oslo perplexed and I return from Oslo more perplexed. Perplexed, but not in despair, for Jesus is Lord over this perplexity itself.

Oslo has brought to my consciousness a greater sense of the realities of the political world, and a greater sense of tragedy than I had before. I for one feel a growing perplexity. Many of us, like me, might have realized the tragic problems of colour and race, of colonies and power-politics, and of poverty, war and hate with a new acuteness which is depressing.

This knowledge of the ugly realities would have been more bearable if Oslo gave some simple analysis and some simple solution to them. On the other hand, what it did was to break down the answers we had before, thus adding to the perplexity.

I remember two very definite experiences of mine at this Conference which I feel I must share with you. On the opening day, we were in this hall with the news of the Dutch-Indonesian war disturbing us. I knew where my political decision lay and I came to that opening meeting full of righteousness for myself for my political decision, and full of anger against the Dutch and having clearly worked out in my own mind, how to force the issue of the Dutch-Indonesian struggle on this Conference. But I remember how when Dr. Visser 't Hooft confessed the guilt of his nation and extended his hand of Christian fellowship to the Indonesian delegation, the righteousness which I had built on my political decision broke to pieces. Some might have clapped their hands. Some might have thought of making political capital out of that statement of Visser 't Hooft. I couldn't think of either of them, because the righteousness of my politics and the justification of my political decision, at that very moment, had broken down into a sense of common guilt, before God in Christ.

A similar experience came to me at the Rally, when John Deschner spoke. Those American friends who have looked at Deschner's statement regarding America as a political statement, might have been angry with him. And ordinarily, with very strong conviction in politics, I would myself have taken it as a political statement and would have used it so. But, in fact under God it had the exact opposite effect on me. It broke down completely the basis on which I was politically standing and politically justifying myself. A sense of common guilt before God in Christ shattered all my politics at that moment. When these and similar experiences came to me I almost wished I never came to this Conference. Was it not foolishness thus to expose myself to a situation of meeting people under God, when over and over again one's political righteousness broke down and revealed itself as irrelevant? Was it right for me thus to weaken my solidarity with those struggling for freedom and justice, my solidarity with those who hunger, the Indonesians who are in a life and death struggle, and with the oppressed people everywhere, on which my political decisions were based? My communist friends whose politics I share would have called me sentimental, and my nationalist friends would have called

me foolish. Over and over again, one felt like isolating oneself from these continuously disturbing meetings, to gather together the broken pieces of one's righteousness and politics, for after all, said I to myself, the political realities still remain, clearly demanding a political answer.

This then is the real tragedy of Christian witness in politics, to which Oslo has called us. On the one hand, political justice necessitates a self-righteousness leading to definite political decisions. On the other, this self-righteousness breaks to pieces, as we expose ourselves to the Cross of Christ wherein we are all seen in common guilt as crucifiers of Christ, needing forgiveness of God and one another. In politics, we are called upon to alternate between this shattering of self-righteousness and this gathering of the pieces of self-righteousness and because of the perplexity and the tragedy we experience within ourselves, certainly a Christian is a creature not bold enough and not strong enough to be totally devoted to any political cause or any political party, however just.

Certainly my communist friends are right. The Cross of Christ is foolishness, because it is the experience of a self-shattering which in politics makes for weakness and not for strength. But was not that moment when I got shattered within myself the very moment when Oslo became real to me as community? Was not Oslo born in that moment when we broke to pieces in a sense of common guilt before the Word of God?

I must add a word of confession before I finish. Because India was on the threshold of independence, I thought I was strong and felt that I could face the Britishers as political equals and imagined that it would make for better fellowship. But yesterday, at the Indian delegation meeting when we as a delegation had to confess that we failed to meet the British delegation as belonging to Christ, to grapple the problem of British-Indian relation, I was overwhelmed by a burden of my own guilt in the matter; and I take this opportunity to confess my guilt in public. And, after all, our political strength, for which we in India have laboured for over a century, has not made for community in Oslo. Many delegations here who were humble enough to face the foolishness and the weakness of the shattering of their pride under the Cross did achieve a community which

will be their strength in the days to come as they, in their separate nations, face their political responsibilities. "He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts. He hath put down the mighty from their seats and exalted those of low degree." If we share His Cross, we shall share His Resurrection. The knowledge of common guilt and divine forgiveness as the basis of common life — this is the political message of Oslo, for all I know.

Perplexed we came, more perplexed we return. But we do not despair, for Jesus is Lord.

This faith releases us for a corporate witness to the sacramental significance of all politics to common life. It will certainly require the continued participation of most of us in the dirty necessities of the rough and tumble of party politics and the call may come to some of us to undertake this task as a group witness. To others, the call may come to witness to the same faith by living a life of conscious protest against all politics, in small communities of reconciliation. But to all the Lordship of Christ must mean a point at which they say "no" to the necessity of the political world, crying, "Here I stand, I can do no other, so help me God!"

M. M. THOMAS.

---

## **BOOK REVIEWS**

**THE INTERSEMINARY SERIES** — The Challenge of our Culture; The Church and Organized Movements; The Gospel, the Church and the World; Toward World-Wide Christianity; What Must the Church Do? — Harper & Brothers, New York and London. \$1.50 per volume.

These five volumes were prepared for a national conference of American theological students held last June under the auspices of the Interseminary Movement in the United States. The reviewer has seen the first four of these books, but would heartily recommend the series as a concise, well-organized and direct presentation of the problems of American Protestantism.

The series had three main purposes : "to outline the character of the contemporary world which challenges the Church ; to proclaim afresh the nature of the Gospel and the Church which must meet that challenge ; and to set forth the claims which ecumenical Christianity makes upon the various Churches as they face their world task". But for the non-American a fourth purpose has been realized, namely, to give the reader a series of snap-shot glimpses of the history, the present situation and the hopes and fears of Protestantism in the United States. While the many sections into which the volumes are divided are necessarily uneven in value, the average level of content is high, particularly considering the limitations of space imposed upon several score authors from the leading ranks of the Protestant Church and theological seminaries.

The first volume's theme is the depersonalization of modern life. In the introduction it is pointed out that, while marxism is the leading competitor of Christianity in much of the modern world, in America this role is played by naturalistic humanism. This point is illustrated in the middle section of the second book, where club life, fraternal movements, the vast network of social welfare work, education, political life, fascist organisations and the cults in America are described and criticized from the standpoint of how they offer resistance to, or resources for, the realization of the Christian purpose and hope. The assumption is that there are points of co-operation for Christianity in most of these secular or sectarian movements, except the worst types of fascism and communism ! The last chapter of volume one, on secularism, contains a trenchant exposé of the weakness of what the author at one point calls the "vast inert hippotamus of American Protestantism". And the chapter on race and colour caste is no less searching in its critique of the failure of Protestantism to deal with racial issues : "the caste of colour controls church life in America just as realistically as it masters others aspects of institutional life".

The third and fourth volumes discuss the nature of the Gospel which the ecumenical church must give to the modern world. Surprisingly, there is little of the uneasiness and near panic which we were given to understand was rather widespread in the United States as a consequence of Hiroshima. While the shallowness

and emptiness of contemporary Christian belief and practice are honestly faced, the conclusion reached is not one of despair. A Christocentric theology is briefly developed, a return to the Bible is urged, and confidence is asserted on the basis of the fact that this is God's world and His purposes for this world cannot be thwarted permanently by mankind. "Nobody will prove it by any sign that things are getting better; and nobody will disprove it by any sign that things are getting worse. It depends on God, Whose nature it is to finish what long since He began and that nature doesn't change". In like manner the old social gospel is criticized for its optimism and lack of theology, and the ecumenical gospel is squarely based on Christ who Himself is that gospel's content. But it is also asserted, no less firmly, that "the corporate life of mankind is our business. And there is plainly no hope for it apart from the Christian Gospel. Ideals will no longer serve." The fourth volume, devoted to ecumenism, demonstrates the faith of all who contribute to the series, a faith in what Robert Bilheimer, secretary of the Interseminary Movement, calls the "Ecumenical Reformation". The stirrings and strivings towards Christian unity, and the various attempts to gather together the broken fragments of the personal gospel, the social gospel, the conservative theology, the liberal theology, the insights of high church and low — all of this points to a new spirit abroad within the whole church. If the church is to bring the gospel to the whole world the church must first of all so listen to that gospel that its witness may be one of deed and act within its own boundaries.

For the European these volumes confirm his suspicion that for many American Christians the assumptions of liberalism are far from dead. However drastic their criticism of the errors of the old liberalism, they still fundamentally hold to the possibility of mankind's improvement and to a belief that the gospel is directly related to it. Nevertheless, they shy away from involvement with communism, which to many Europeans is destined to become the new secularism of a new age. Will American Christianity collapse with the humanistic and capitalistic culture with which it is so largely identified, according to these four volumes? Is it capable of making a better adjustment to communism than it has done to the older humanism? Whatever

the final answers to these questions, it is obvious that the awakening of the younger generation of American Christian leaders constitutes a hope for the future for which all Christendom should be thankful.

R. B. TILLMAN.

THE COMING GREAT CHURCH. By Theodore O. Wedel. S.C.M. Press, London. 7s. 6d.

Recent evidence goes to show that throughout the Federation there is a new and increasing interest in the nature and problems of church unity. The concern of many national movements about their relationships with the churches in their own country has naturally resulted in a concern about the relationships of these churches with each other, and many individual students who had not previously come to grips with the ecumenical problem have had it forced upon them by their experiences at conferences during the last two summers. But the evidence is equally strong, that even where there is interest there is much ignorance and frequently a good deal of misunderstanding. Some who are enthusiastic for ecumenism are dangerous friends and others who are suspicious of it are potentially its exponents. The value of Dr. Wedel's book might be summed up by saying that if it is read widely throughout the Federation and the Churches there will be a very considerable advance toward clarity of thinking and understanding in this whole field.

The title, however, is unfortunate. It may suggest that the author believes optimistically that some new kind of inclusive church is on the way, perhaps just round the corner. The suspicion that ecumenical enthusiasts *do* labour under such an illusion is one of the chief reasons why many excellent people adopt an attitude of reserve to ecumenism. In point of fact Dr. Wedel has no such illusions. He is himself in the ministry of the Episcopal Church in America, a church to which he found his way because of its retention of the "catholic" traditions of historic Christianity as contrasted with the Mennonite Church of his birth. And he knows quite well that we are not ready for reunion. "Reunion will be endlessly costly. None of us as yet fully wants it, despite generous lip-service to ecumenical ideals. We want

it on our terms..." His concern is not with any easy schemes or any new kind of church but with the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, revealed in scripture and manifested in history. His basic conviction is that "the doctrine of the Church and the related doctrine of the Holy Spirit are the forgotten doctrines of Christian tradition", and that the only way to Church Unity is by a rediscovery of their meaning and richness and a rigorous submission by all the churches of their present traditions to the judgment of God's revelation. If Dr. Wedel can be called an optimist his optimism is simply that he believes that the Spirit will lead the people of God into new relationships with each other when they listen to his guidance. And if he is not afraid to talk of reunion as well as of unity it is because he sees clearly that any interpretation of Christian unity which excludes reunion as the ultimate goal is false to the teaching of the New Testament which knows no doctrine of an "invisible church". All these things are basic — perhaps even elementary — to an understanding of ecumenism. But they are far from being universally understood. It is one of the major merits of Dr. Wedel's book that they are not merely stated explicitly but that they inform the treatment of the particular problems to which the four separate essay-lectures are devoted.

The first essay which gives its title to the whole is actually the slightest of the four, but will be very useful to those who are new to the subject and revealing to those who have not realised the importance of the theological revival in Protestantism for the future of the ecumenical movement. The second on the *Church of Christian Faith* is outstanding, especially in its application of the New Testament doctrine of the Holy Spirit to church life, and practices of today. One could wish for a much fuller treatment of the subject along these lines. The third is concerned with the *Catholic-Protestant Chasm*, about which Dr. Wedel writes with remarkable insight and appreciation of the deepest convictions of both sides. He is naturally and rightly convinced that his own church has a key-role to play in bridging the gulf but he avoids all complacency in regarding Anglicanism as a *via media*, and expresses doubt as to whether the tensions it has experienced within itself have been altogether for good. The last essay on the *Problem of Church Order* is an interesting

attempt to approach this thorny subject from the point of view of the Holy Communion. In parts it is very suggestive, but alone among the essays it does not quite avoid the danger of indicating problems rather than opening them up.

In conclusion, it should be said that the spirit in which this book is written is a model for ecumenical discussion. It combines charity, vision and charming personal modesty with pungent expression and sturdy criticism. Dr. Wedel explicitly acknowledges his debt to *The Student World*. It will be a happy result if many readers of *The Student World*, like the reviewer, come to acknowledge a deep debt to Dr. Wedel.

E. M. D.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE TO THE HINDU. By A. G. Hogg : S.C.M. Press, London. 6/- net.

ETERNAL LIFE — NOW. By D. T. Niles : St. Joseph's Catholic Press, Jaffna, Ceylon.

It has been the proud honour of South India to have had Dr. Hogg for many years as principal of one of the foremost Christian colleges in India, the Madras Christian College. Even for those of us who have not had the privilege of studying in the institution over which he presided, not only as philosopher, but also as friend and guide, he has remained an inspiration through his friends, his talks and his writings. Hindus who came into contact with him adored him. Therefore the very fact that the book under review comes from the pen of Dr. Hogg is itself an introduction to most educated people, Christian and non-Christian, in South India.

This book however has a special challenge of its own. Apart from the fact that it comes from the scholarly pen of Hogg, it is the result of calm reflection in retirement on a life-long experience in the interpretation of the Christian message to the Hindu. In it, "one to whom for some three dozen years there was committed the privilege of seeking to declare and interpret Christ to Indian youth", gives to the reader a glimpse of the life and experiences of a thoughtful missionary to the Hindus, and "submits a study of a few features characteristic of the

gospel — features which are so distinctive that they need to be held in the forefront of attention, if its true challenge and appeals to be apprehended by the Hindu mind and is to constrain it to face the issue of a decisive acceptance or rejection". The book is thus of "special interest for those whose vocation it is to proclaim the gospel to the Hindus". But the features of the Gospel presented by the author belong to its core, so that "they need to be held in the forefront of attention" of anyone, Christian or non-Christian, to whom the Gospel is preached. Thus the book deserves study by all those concerned with evangelism. It might profitably be made a study book of the Federation on evangelism.

The book starts with the affirmation that what is wanted in evangelism is "a challenging relevancy". This raises the whole problem of the much-discussed "point of contact" between the Gospel and the hearer. Hogg draws his inspiration from Christ's own missionary approach to the Jews of His day; and he concludes, "The message needs not only to be challengingly conceived but to be relevantly expressed. It must meet the hearer at some point where he is conscious, or can be made conscious, of a spiritual need". And Hogg is not unconscious of the peril involved in seeking such relevant modes of presentation, the peril of "a christianising of Hinduism"; and he therefore calls "for a lively apprehension of the full spiritual challenge which the Gospel makes to India", on the part of the missionary.

Hogg does "not see eye to eye with those who have looked for a sympathetic line of missionary approach in the conception that Christianity is the *finding* of that for which Hinduism has been only the *seeking*", because "Hindu faith has known of a finding as well as a seeking", and the divergence is exactly in that "what has been sought is *not* the same". It is because of this that the gospel can never be added on to another faith and stands as a challenging message calling for radical conversion. Hogg illustrates this by choosing five key doctrines of the Christian faith—Incarnation, Church, Kingdom, Atonement and Preaching, where Christian and Hindu religions face the same human problem, asking different questions and seeking different answers, because they have basically different axes. Herein the author reveals the challenge of the Gospel, not to this or that conception in the Hindu faith, but to its very citadel.

"Of all the contours which distinguish the gospel edifice from every other spiritual habitation", says Hogg, "the most determinative is the absolute Lordship of Christ". This has been the message of Oslo 1947. And it is just here that the Hindu mind, full of veneration for the character of Jesus, finds the real stumbling block to the Christian Faith. But this stumbling block, Hogg maintains, is of the very essence of the Gospel. What the Hindu seeks is "salvation by turning away from the concrete and temporal to the contemplation of the abstract and timeless" — he seeks *samadhi*. And therefore the faith in a genuine incarnation of God, (as contrast to *avatar*), based as it is on a faith that history is pregnant with eternal meaning and moves towards a goal, demands of the Hindu a discarding of the very axis of his faith. Says Hogg: "An authentically Christian faith in the Incarnation in Jesus, in an historical judgment upon sin in His Cross, and in a call to follow a Risen Victor, cannot be simply added to Hindu faith even in its theistic forms as merely a hitherto missing complement". The other dogmas of the Christian faith also require of the Hindu the same radical conversion in accepting the Gospel. Come, Follow Me; Come, Join My Church; Seek the Kingdom of God; Come, Face with Me the *Karma* of Humanity; Preach the Love which is a Consuming Fire — it is only as a missionary in India continually and relevantly presents these Gospel initiatives and challenges, which form the titles of the chapters of the book, that he can be said to be preaching the Gospel to the Hindu.

The process of thought and experience through which Hogg, towards the end of his missionary career, came to accept the Church as a *constitutive* and not merely a consequential aspect of the Gospel was very striking to the reviewer. Reflecting on his experiences as a missionary, the author raises the doubt whether the integral place of the Church in the Gospel has ever got sufficient stress "in the preaching and teaching" in the Indian mission-field and confesses regretfully that "it had very little place in my own teaching". The reviewer remembers how Sadhu Mathai, the Sevak of Christavasram who has always been a challenge to the Christian youth of Travancore and outside, almost always carries with him his copy of *Christ's Message of the Kingdom* by Hogg and how often he has listened to Sadjuji

on the challenging content of Hogg's book — that the Kingdom opened up the possibility for individuals "consistent sinlessness" and full freedom from all "natural" evil through the miraculous release of divine power. And in the book under review Hogg says that this "did not seem to be borne out even by the experience of the saints" and that this problem "insoluble on individualistic premisses did much to drive me beyond individualism". "I began to surmise", he says, "that mine was an unreal problem, deriving its speciousness from an individualism in my conceptions of sinfulness and redemption from sin, an individualism which was beginning to be condemned both by my studies in the field of ethics and by a better understanding of the Bible". This confession must be profitable to many as it has been to the reviewer. And when he read this, he felt that, perhaps, the exposition of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as a means to the creation of individual christs by P. Chenchiah of Madras and his re-thinking group, also suffered from the same individualism and needed the same corrective by "a better understanding of the Bible". In any event, this book has a message to the missions and churches of India, where "the chief stumbling block is the offence of the Church — the offence of the summons to join a community which abjures the authority of that system of corporate life into which the very being of the Hindu has been woven and which the new nationalism takes pride in as a precious heritage".

Space does not permit the reviewer to do justice to D. T. Niles' book which is "a presentation of the Christian Faith to the Buddhist". "D. T." is not unknown to the readers of *The Student World*! This book by him is an illustration of the application of Hogg's principle of "challenging relevancy". The first and last chapters give the Christian perspective of evangelism and will be very profitable reading, even to those who may not meet a Buddhist all their life.

M. M. T.

## INDEX TO VOLUME XL

|  | PAGE              |
|--|-------------------|
| The Biblical Perspective . . . . .                         | 251               |
| Book Reviews . . . . .                                     | 89, 184, 284, 376 |
| Azariah of Dornakal . . . . .                              | 90                |
| Beyond Prejudice . . . . .                                 | 190               |
| Beyond This Darkness . . . . .                             | 187               |
| Christian Faith and My Job . . . . .                       | 184               |
| The Christian Message to the Hindu. . . . .                | 381               |
| The Coming Great Church . . . . .                          | 379               |
| Eternal Life — Now . . . . .                               | 381               |
| Freedom and Control — A Christian Interpretation. . . . .  | 287               |
| In Pursuit of Justice. . . . .                             | 89                |
| The Interseminary Series . . . . .                         | 376               |
| The Rebirth of the German Church . . . . .                 | 284               |
| University Pamphlets. . . . .                              | 92                |
| Christian Community: Fact and Judgment . . . . .           | 262               |
| Christian Community in the Federation. . . . .             | 5                 |
| A Christian Discussion of the University . . . . .         | 296               |
| Christian Forgiveness . . . . .                            | 108               |
| The Christian Student and his Studies . . . . .            | 325               |
| The Crisis in the University . . . . .                     | 293               |
| Democracy Must Overcome Itself. . . . .                    | 226               |
| The Dilemma of the Displaced Students . . . . .            | 56                |
| Editorials. . . . .  | 1, 97, 193, 289   |
| The Editor's Travel Diary . . . . .                        | 68, 165, 269, 359 |
| Faith and Reason. . . . .                                  | 312               |
| Forgiveness in the Bible. . . . .                          | 160               |
| The Forgiveness of God and the Forgiveness of Men. . . . . | 128               |

|  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Forgiving One Another . . . . .                            | 120  |
| The Foundations of Forgiveness . . . . .                   | 144  |
| Guilt and Forgiveness . . . . .                            | 104  |
| India Seeks Democracy . . . . .                            | 208  |
| International Student Service, A Personal View . . . . .   | 17   |
| Is there a Common Meeting Ground ? . . . .                 | 243  |
| The Origins of Western Democracy . . . . .                 | 199  |
| Pages from a German Travel Diary . . . . .                 | 364  |
| Peace through Forgiveness . . . . .                        | 136  |
| Personality in Professor and Student . . . . .             | 322  |
| Prayer and the Christian Student . . . . .                 | 354  |
| The Problem of History for the Christian . . . . .         | 336  |
| Should we put our Faith in Democracy ? . . . .             | 238  |
| The Student World Chronicle                                |      |
| American Student Democracy in Action . . . . .             | 274  |
| A Call to Youth . . . . .                                  | 177  |
| De Universitate . . . . .                                  | 180  |
| A Greek Declaration . . . . .                              | 281  |
| The Mythology of Science . . . . .                         | 287  |
| John R. Mott Peacemaker . . . . .                          | 87   |
| The Orthodox Movement in Greece . . . . .                  | 83   |
| The Political Message of Oslo . . . . .                    | 373  |
| Student Work in Isolated Government Universities . . . . . | 85   |
| The Travel Diary of an American in Europe . . . . .        | 76   |
| A Twentieth Century <i>Pax Romana</i> . . . . .            | 10   |
| Two New World Movements . . . . .                          | 27   |
| The University in a Technological Age . . . . .            | 341  |
| The Urgency of Forgiveness . . . . .                       | 114  |
| World Christian Youth Cooperation . . . . .                | 42   |

#### *List of Authors*

|                           |         |
|---------------------------|---------|
| Anderson, Leila . . . . . | 238     |
| Bratsiotis, P. . . . .    | 83, 336 |
| Capek, J. B. . . . .      | 322     |

|                             | PAGE                      |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Coleman, A. John . . . . .  | 27, 92, 180, 287, 296     |
| Crombie, Ian . . . . .      | 199                       |
| Deschner, John . . . . .    | 76                        |
| Dirkse, J. . . . .          | 104                       |
| Duncan, Eric M. . . . .     | 284, 379                  |
| Francu, Dusan . . . . .     | 243                       |
| Frykholm, Yngve . . . . .   | 56                        |
| Haller, M.-J. de . . . . .  | 160                       |
| Hatzfeld, Henri . . . . .   | 226                       |
| Hesse, Mary . . . . .       | 278                       |
| Hoffman, Bengt . . . . .    | 190, 364                  |
| Holroyd, Michael . . . . .  | 17                        |
| House, Francis H. . . . .   | 42                        |
| Johnson, Alex . . . . .     | 114                       |
| Keet, B. B. . . . .         | 108                       |
| Kiortsis, B. . . . .        | 83                        |
| Li, C. W. . . . .           | 262                       |
| Mackie, Dorothy . . . . .   | 90                        |
| Milford, T. R. . . . .      | 354                       |
| Miller, Alexander . . . . . | 251                       |
| Morton, Helen . . . . .     | 5                         |
| Newbegin, J. E. L. . . . .  | 120                       |
| Niemöller, Martin . . . . . | 136                       |
| Pelletier, Gérard . . . . . | 10                        |
| Preiss, Théo . . . . .      | 144                       |
| Preston, Ronald . . . . .   | 325                       |
| R. C. M. . . . .            | 68, 87, 89, 165, 269, 359 |
| Rowland, Wilmina . . . . .  | 187                       |
| Schanke, Andreas . . . . .  | 274                       |
| Serikoff, Georges . . . . . | 128                       |
| Thomas, M. M. . . . .       | 208, 341, 373, 381        |
| Tillman, R. B. . . . .      | 376                       |
| Wiley, Basil . . . . .      | 312                       |

Lausanne. — Imprimerie La Concorde. 1452/12.47.